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Abstract:
We tackle deconvolution of motion blur in hand-held consumer photography with a Bayesian framework combining sparse gradient and color priors for regularization. We develop a closed-form optimization utilizing iterated re-weighted least squares (IRLS) with a Gaussian approximation of the regularization priors. The model parameters of the priors can be learned from a set of natural images which resemble common image statistics. We thoroughly evaluate and discuss the effect of different regularization factors and make suggestions for reasonable values. Both gradient and color priors are current state-of-the-art. In natural images the magnitude of gradients resembles a kurtotic hyper-Laplacian distribution, and the two-color model exploits the observation that locally any color is a linear approximation between some primary and secondary colors. Our contribution is integrating both priors into a single optimization framework and providing a more detailed derivation of their optimization functions. Our re-implementation reveals different model parameters than previously published, and the effectiveness of the color priors alone are explicitly examined. Finally, we propose a context-adaptive parameterization of the regularization factors in order to avoid over-smoothing the deconvolution result within highly textured areas.

1 Introduction

Removing motion blur due to camera shake is a special branch of the ill-posed deconvolution problem. Its specific challenges are the relatively large blur kernels and image noise which usually is stronger here, because camera shake is often caused by longer exposure times during low-light photography where sensor noise is inherently amplified due to higher analog gain and shot noise. Another characteristic property is that the blur kernels are not isotropic as with out-of-focus blur, but instead these point spread functions (PSFs) model the path of motion that a handheld camera undertakes during the exposure time of the photograph, and therefore the PSFs have a ridge-like and sparse appearance (Liu et al., 2008).

We here tackle the problem of non-blind deconvolution where the motion blur kernel (or PSF) is exactly known a priori. In the real world, the gyroscope of a mobile phone camera might give a good estimate of the blur kernel. If motion information is not available at all, then we talk about blind deconvolution where the blur kernel needs to be estimated solely with the help of the blurred image at hand (Shi et al., 2013; Dong et al., 2012a). Since this is rather difficult there are also some image fusion approaches, known as semi-blind deconvolution (Yuan et al., 2007; Ito et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2012). Our approach assumes a globally constant blur kernel (Schmidt et al., 2013), but in general image blur is space-varying (Sorel and Sroubek, 2012; Ji and Wang, 2012; Whyte et al., 2012; Gupta et al., 2010).

Most deconvolution approaches apply a regularization term to the gradients of the image, by penalizing steep gradients that could be indicative of noise. Regularization based upon
the $\ell_2$ norm (Gaussian prior) and the $\ell_1$ norm (Laplacian prior, total variation) tend to oversmooth the deconvolution results. The so-called sparse priors (Levin and Weiss, 2007; Levin et al., 2007b; Li et al., 2013) more adequately capture the observed hyper-Laplacian gradient distributions (Srivastava et al., 2003; Huang, 2000). Here, the color model-based regularization (Joshi et al., 2009) motivated by (Cecchi et al., 2010) imposes a two-color model upon locally smooth regions. Thereby, we concurrently make use of global and local sparseness (Dong et al., 2012b) alike by using gradient and color priors, respectively.

### 1.1 Sparse Gradient Prior

Most ‘real’ images resemble a common gradient distribution (Levin and Weiss, 2007; Levin et al., 2007b; Simoncelli, 1997). Under for example the $\ell_1$-norm, the gradient magnitude can be calculated for a pixel $i$ by

$$\| (\nabla I)_i \|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} |d_{k,i}|,$$

where $d_{k,i}$ represents the $k$-th partial derivative, $\vec{d}_k$, evaluated at pixel $i$ of image $I$. Such a directional derivative $\vec{d}_k := \text{vec}(I * G_k)$ can be determined by convolving the image $I$ with derivative filter kernels $G_k$, like $(1 -1)^T$ and $(1 -1)^T$ and the second-order derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$, $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial xy}$.

In Fig. 1, we examine the gradient distributions of the images from Fig. 4 and compare them with unwanted deconvolution results. These histogram plots show that only the ground truth photographs exhibit the kurtotic hyper-Laplacian shape, but blurry and noisy images show totally different statistics. However, if the blur is linear and orthogonal to the direction of the derivative, then edges stay mostly intact – but still the kurtotic tail is lowered (compare Fig. 1a and 1c). Similarly to our analysis (Lin et al., 2011) shows gradient distributions of exemplarily patches of motion blurred vs. sharp textures.

Instead of using gradients as a sparse prior, one could use any kind of filtering result that provides a sparse representation of the image. We also tried the learned filters approach within the Fields-of-Experts (FoE) framework. Thereby we modified the MATLAB code of (Weiss and Freeman, 2007) so that we obtained a kurtotic curve model. Then we learned two different sets of 5 and 25 filters of $15 \times 15$ pixels. As opposed to (Schmidt et al., 2011) we did not find an increase in performance, but our results were comparable to the sparse gradient prior.

### 1.2 Two-color Model

As in (Joshi et al., 2009), for each pixel $\vec{c}_i$ of a latent image estimate $I$, we define a pixel neighborhood – e.g., using a square $5 \times 5$ window – and determine the primary and secondary col-
ors within this neighborhood. Thereby, an initial 
two-color model is obtained by k-means clustering 
(with \( k = 2 \)). While k-means provides a good heuristic for finding an initial two-color model, 
the drawback is that one color sample can always only be assigned to exactly one cluster, and therefore 
noise is not appropriately handled. A fuzzy 
expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm based upon the method described in (Joshi et al., 2009) 
therefore refines the color clusters. Finally, the 
primary color \( \bar{p}_i \) is assigned to the cluster whose 
center lies closest to the color of the center pixel \( \bar{c}_i \) defining the neighborhood. The secondary color \( \bar{s}_i \) is assigned to the other cluster. The two-color model as depicted in Fig. 2a now works upon 

\[
\bar{c}_i \approx \bar{\ell}_i := \alpha_i \bar{s}_i + (1 - \alpha_i)\bar{p}_i, 
\]

(2)

In contrast to (Joshi et al., 2009), \( \bar{p}_i \) and \( \bar{s}_i \) have been swapped with regard to \( \alpha_i \), such that \( \alpha_i \) is minimal at \( \bar{p}_i \) instead of \( \bar{s}_i \), because this will simplify our IRLS optimization later on.

2 Constructing the Color Prior

The so-called alpha prior introduced by (Joshi et al., 2009) penalizes \( \alpha_i \) values which would put 
the estimated color \( \bar{c}_i \) far away from either the primary or secondary color. The penalty is based 
upon the observed \( \alpha_i \) distribution in natural images. The value of \( \alpha_i \) for a pixel \( \bar{c}_i \), given \( \bar{p}_i \) and \( \bar{s}_i \), is calculated using (Joshi et al., 2009, eq. 10):

\[
\alpha_i = \frac{\alpha_i'}{\|\bar{s}_i - \bar{p}_i\|} = \left( \frac{(\bar{s}_i - \bar{p}_i)}{(\bar{s}_i - \bar{p}_i)\top(\bar{s}_i - \bar{p}_i)} \right)\top(\bar{c}_i - \bar{p}_i).
\]

(3)

Typical distributions of \( \alpha \) values determined from natural images using either the refined EM or bare k-means color clustering are shown in Fig. 2b and 2c. As in Fig. 2b, these negative log-likelihoods can be fit with a piecewise hyper-Laplacian prior term of the form

\[
b(a) = b \mid \bar{\ell}_i = \bar{c}_i - \bar{\ell}_i \bar{p}_i \|^a. \quad (4)
\]

We calculated the two-color model from about 400 images of the Berkeley image segmentation database. For a custom set of fit parameters, the constructed color models were exported into Matlab and approximate probability densities have been estimated for each image using a Parzen window method. Then, a non-linear least-squares fit was performed using Matlab’s \texttt{fminsearch()} method for the piecewise hyper-Laplacian function described above. In (Joshi et al., 2009) a 2 pieces fit is proposed, but we found that it is not sufficiently accurate for approximating the statistics of the relatively noise-free ground truth images. The resulting parameters for our 3 pieces fit are:

\[
a = 0.7153, \quad b = 0.8066 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha_i < -0.5; \\
a = 0.6448, \quad b = 4.5318 \quad \text{for} \quad -0.5 \leq \alpha_i < 0; \\
a = 0.2298, \quad b = 2.7372 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i.
\]

2.1 Optimization Techniques

For weighted least squares (WLS) (Faraway, 2002, p. 62), a weighting matrix \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is introduced. The WLS objective function therefore is
\[
\sum_k \sum_l r_k W_{k,l} \tau_l = \| \vec{y} - T \vec{x} \|_W^2
\]

\[= (\vec{y} - T \vec{x})^T W (\vec{y} - T \vec{x}),\]

where \(\| \cdot \|_W\) is the Mahalanobis distance. To minimize this function, we need to determine the gradient and set it equal to zero. The WLS derivative

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{x}} \| \vec{y} - T \vec{x} \|_W^2 = -2T^T W \vec{y} + 2T^T W T \vec{x}
\]
yields the system of the so-called normal equations of WLS (Gentle, 2007, p. 338)

\[
(T^T W T) \vec{x} - T^T W \vec{y} = \vec{0}
\]

which represents a linear equation system of the form \(A \vec{x} = \vec{0}\). Here, \(A = T^T W T\) is too large to be inverted in-place, and hence we use the CG (Conjugate Gradient) method.

The M-estimator (Meer, 2004, p. 47) applies a robust penalty or loss function \(\rho\) to the error residuals \(r_i\). For \(\rho(r_i) := |r_i|^p, p \neq 2\), the optimization becomes non-linear. However, the iteratively re-weighted least squares (IRLS) method (Scales et al., 1988; Scales and Gersztenkorn, 1988) approximates the solution by turning the problem into a series of WLS sub-problems. A faster version of this algorithm for the problem at hand is discussed in (Krishnan and Fergus, 2009). In each IRLS iteration, a new set of weights is learned from the previous solution. For the first iteration, all weights can be initialized with a constant value. The weights \(w_i\) of the diagonal WLS weighting matrix \(W\) are ([1]: Meer, 2004, p. 48); [2]: (Scales et al., 1988, p. 332):

\[w_i^{(r+1)} = w(r_i^{(r)}) \left[ \frac{1}{r_i^{(r)}} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{r_i^{(r)}} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{r_i^{(r)}} \right] \leq 2 |r_i^{(r)}|^{p-2}.\]

#### 2.2 Minimizing the Alpha Prior

As already shown in Fig. 2b, the \(\alpha_i\) distribution is bimodal since both \(\alpha_1 = 0\) and \(\alpha_1 = 1\) are minima and the distribution is symmetric at \(\alpha_1 = 0.5\). However, since we want to bias the observed color \(\vec{c}_i\) to the primary color \(\vec{p}_i\) at \(\alpha_i \neq 0\), only the unimodal prior (represented by the red, dashed line) is used. The weights of the alpha prior in IRLS step \((r + 1)\) that follow by applying eqn. 8 to eqn. 4 are:

\[w_i^{(r+1)} = a \cdot b \cdot |\alpha_i^{(r)}|^{a-2}.\]

Note that the constant coefficient \(a\) is missing in this term given by (Joshi et al., 2009, eqn. 13). With these weights, the WLS can be performed with the RGB components of the latent image \(I \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\) as the parameter vector \(\vec{x} := (c_1^T, \ldots, c_s^T)^T = (I_{R,1}, I_{G,1}, I_{B,1}, \ldots, I_{R,s}, I_{G,s}, I_{B,s})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3s}\). For eqn. 5 with \(s = m n\) the total amount of image pixels. Following the definition of \(\alpha_i\) (eqn. 3) and splitting \(\alpha_i\) into a variable and a constant part, the WLS coefficient matrix \(T\) is block diagonal:

\[
T := \begin{pmatrix}
-\ell_i^T & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \ddots & -\ell_s^T \\
0 & \cdots & -\ell_s^T
\end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times 3s}.
\]

The constant part \(\vec{y}\) of the WLS objective function is then a vector

\[
\vec{y} := (-\ell_1^T \vec{p}_1, \ldots, -\ell_s^T \vec{p}_s)^T \in \mathbb{R}^s.
\]

Due to the block-diagonal form of \(T\), the WLS normal equations can be evaluated for the alpha prior individually per pixel. Inserting the above definitions and expanding eqn. 6 leads to the gradient in block matrix form

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{y}} \lambda \| \vec{y} - T \vec{x} \|_W^2 = 2\lambda \begin{pmatrix}
R_1 \vec{c}_1 \\
\vdots \\
R_s \vec{c}_s
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
R_1 \vec{p}_1 \\
\vdots \\
R_s \vec{p}_s
\end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3s} (9)
\]

with \(R_i := w_i^{(r)} \cdot \ell_i \ell_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}\) where the \(3 \times 3\) matrix \(R_i\) is called the re-weighting term by (Joshi et al., 2009, eqn. 13), and contains the weights \(w_i^{(r)}\) learned from the previous IRLS iteration's deconvolution result. The outer product \(\ell_i \ell_i^T\) appears because of the matrix products \(T^T \cdots \cdot T\) and \(T^T \cdots \cdot \vec{y}\) in the term \(2T^T W T \vec{x} - 2T^T W \vec{y}\). \(\lambda_\alpha\) is a regularization factor of the alpha prior.

#### 2.3 Penalty on the Distance \(d\)

Besides the prior on \(\alpha_i\) values, another penalty term is introduced by (Joshi et al., 2009) that minimizes the squared distance \(d_\alpha^2\) (Fig. 2a). In contrast to the \(\alpha_i\) prior, this penalty term is not based upon any observed probability distribution.
in real images. Instead, the \( d_i \) is simply minimized (Joshi et al., 2009, eqn. 8). Given \( \vec{p}_i \) and \( \vec{s}_i \), then \( o_d(\vec{c}_i) := \lambda_d \cdot d_i^2 = \lambda_d ||\vec{c}_i - \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i)||^2 = \lambda_d ||\vec{c}_i - [\alpha_i(\vec{c}_i) \cdot (\vec{s}_i - \vec{p}_i) + \vec{p}_i]||^2 \) whereby the regularization factor \( \lambda_d \) specifies the strength of this penalty term. In the above objective function, \( \vec{c}_i \in \mathbb{R}^4 \) represents the color of a single pixel \( i \) of the latent image \( \vec{t}_i \), and is thus a variable. \( \alpha_i \) and hence \( \vec{t}_i \) are functions of \( \vec{c}_i \) (see eqn. 3). This is different from the alpha prior, where the calculated \( \alpha_i \) was fixed during the CG optimization because the weights for the hyper-Laplacian alpha prior only get updated during IRLS iterations. \( \vec{p}_i \) and \( \vec{s}_i \), on the other hand, can be regarded as constants until a new color model is built.

The \( d \) penalty term is optimized by least-squares and its gradient is

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} o_d(\vec{c}_i) = \lambda_d \left[ \vec{c}_i - \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) \right]^\top \left[ \vec{c}_i - \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) \right] = 2\lambda_d \left[ \text{id}_3 - \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) \right]^\top \left[ \vec{c}_i - \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) \right]
\]

with \( \text{id}_3 \) being a 3 \( \times \) 3 identity matrix. Further differentiation leads to

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} \alpha_i(\vec{c}_i) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i)^\top (\vec{s}_i - \vec{p}_i) = \vec{t}_i, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} \alpha_i(\vec{c}_i)(\vec{s}_i - \vec{p}_i) = \vec{t}_i(\vec{s}_i - \vec{p}_i)^\top,
\end{align*}
\]

such that

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{c}_i} o_d(\vec{c}_i) = 2\lambda_d \left[ \text{id}_3 + \vec{t}_i(\vec{p}_i - \vec{s}_i)^\top \right] \left[ \vec{c}_i - \vec{t}_i(\vec{c}_i) \right].
\]

As \( \alpha_i(\vec{c}_i) \) contains both a part that is dependent on \( \vec{c}_i \) and one that is constant (namely \( \vec{t}_i \)), the gradient is split up for the CG method. The RGB blocks for the pixels \( i = 1, \ldots, s \) of the vectors \((\vec{c}_{3i-2}, \ldots, 3i) \in \mathbb{R}^{3a}\) and \((\vec{p}_{3i-2}, \ldots, 3i) \in \mathbb{R}^{3a}\) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
2\lambda_d \left[ \text{id}_3 + \vec{t}_i(\vec{p}_i - \vec{s}_i)^\top \right] \left[ \vec{c}_i + \vec{t}_i^\top \vec{c}_i(\vec{p}_i - \vec{s}_i) \right] &\in \mathbb{R}^3, \\
2\lambda_d \left[ \text{id}_3 + \vec{t}_i(\vec{p}_i - \vec{s}_i)^\top \right] \left[ \vec{p}_i + \vec{t}_i^\top \vec{p}_i(\vec{p}_i - \vec{s}_i) \right] &\in \mathbb{R}^3.
\end{align*}
\]

(10)

3 Optimization with Both Priors

For a closed-form expression of the linear system \( A\vec{x} - \vec{b} = \vec{0} \), the gradients of the sparse prior, the data likelihood, the color prior \( \alpha \) (eqn. 9) and the penalty term on \( d \) (eqn. 10) are summed up. Since the data likelihood and the sparse prior work on intensity images, the individual color channels \( \vec{c} \) and the blurry image \( \vec{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{3a} \), and then combined again after the gradients of the penalty terms are applied as shown in Fig. 3.

Thereby, the binary operator ext : \( \{R, G, B\} \times \mathbb{R}^{3a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^a \) extracts the color channel specified by the first argument from an image \( \vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{3a} \) into a vector \( \vec{a} \in \mathbb{R}^a \). The unary operator join - merges a set \((\vec{R}, \vec{u}_R), (\vec{G}, \vec{u}_G), (\vec{B}, \vec{u}_B)\) of 3 separate channels back into an RGB image \( \vec{v} \). The weights in the matrices \( W_k, R_k \), as well as the primary and secondary colors of the two-color model, are re-calculated after each IRLS iteration. In the first iteration, \( \lambda_\alpha \) and \( \lambda_d \) are set to 0 and hence only the sparse prior is active then.

3.1 Regularization Parameters

First, we want to find a suitable range of parameter values with which reasonable deconvolution results can be achieved. Therefore, the blurred, noisy versions of the ground truth images from Fig. 4 have been deconvolved, using their accompanying PSFs as shown. For the sparse prior a hyper-Laplacian exponent of \( \gamma = 0.5 \) was used together with the default first- and second-order derivative filters (5 filters in total). The exponent \( \gamma = 0.5 \) was chosen because of \( \gamma \in [0.5, 0.8] \) for the gradient distribution of most natural images (Huang, 2000, pp. 19–24). The influence \( \lambda_{\gamma,k} \) of the second-order derivatives was set to a constant \( \frac{1}{4} \), as done by (Levin et al., 2007a).

We used PSNR (peak signal-to-noise ratio) and MSSIM (multi-scale structural similarity index) (Wang et al., 2003) for evaluating the goodness of the deconvolution results. Thereby, MSSIM takes into account interdependencies of local pixel neighborhoods which otherwise get averaged out by the more traditional but established PSNR method. High-quality digital images have PSNRs between 30db and 50db, whereas 20db to 30db are still regarded as acceptable. With PSNR we have a context-independent measure for sole signal quality, and MSSIM gives us the similarity between a ground truth and estimated texture without severely punishing correlated errors. There are metrics available that quantize the degree of image blur directly, but since these are more or less based on the same kurtotic model of the distribution of gradients (Yun-Fang, 2010; Liu et al., 2008) where our optimization model for natural images is built upon, we did not consider these further. Frequency-based methods to blur de-
the error bars denote the sample standard deviation of MSSIM and PSNR values of all 8 images, and the thin lines represent the maximum and minimum MSSIM and PSNR values of all 8 images, and the error bars denote the sample standard deviations. On average and also subjectively, best results were obtained for \( \lambda^C \) between 0.5 and 2.5 depending on the noise level.

The paper by (Joshi et al., 2009) suggests a reduced regularization factor, \( \lambda^C \), in the initialization phase of the sparse prior in order to preserve details. Then, \( \lambda^C \) can be increased, once the penalty terms based upon the two-color model become active. However, their proposed values are inconsistent: \( \lambda^C = 0.25 \) followed by \( \lambda^C = 0.5 \) is mentioned at one occasion, \( \lambda^C = 1 \) at another. This approach can be problematic if the initial \( \lambda^C \) is chosen too low (e.g. \( \lambda^C = 0.8 \)). Details are preserved, but also artifacts within near-to-homogeneous regions are introduced as can be deduced from Fig. 5. Here, the thin curves denoting the absolute minima of MSSIM values are significantly worse than their overall mean subtracted by their standard deviation (whereas this gap is not observable for the maximum value curves; this observation is only true up until \( \lambda^C = 1.0 \)). On the other hand, a high regularization factor such as \( \lambda^C = 3.0 \) over-smoothes the image. We therefore suggest a nearly constant regularization factor for the gradient prior. E.g., for a noise standard deviation of \( \sigma = 2.5\% \), \( \lambda^C \) might initially be set to 1.5 and then be increased to 2. Note that \( \lambda^C = 2 \) is slightly above the optimal value discovered for this noise level in Fig. 5; experience shows, though, that rather smooth images require a slightly higher \( \lambda^C \).

4 Evaluation and Discussion

First, we discuss the effects of the color prior and then we show some qualitative results.

4.1 Understanding the Color Prior

In order to better understand the practical implications of the two-color model, we show some...
Figure 4: Ground truth pictures and their accompanying blur kernels. Image sizes are approx. 800 × 600 pixels and blur kernels are 27 × 27, 49 × 29, 31 × 31, 39 × 39, 27 × 27, 29 × 29, 51 × 45, 95 × 95, respectively.

Figure 5: Average MSSIM and PSNR values for the evaluation image set with its paired blur kernels of Fig. 4 at three different noise levels σ as a function of the regularization parameter λₜ. 

(a) Noise standard deviation σ = 1%

(b) Noise standard deviation σ = 2.5%

(c) Noise standard deviation σ = 5%
segmentation into primary and secondary colors in Fig. 6. The original image is decomposed by EM clustering of a $5 \times 5$ pixel neighborhood into a layer of primary colors (Fig. 6b) and secondary colors (Fig. 6c). The two-color model applies only at pixels where the color difference between both layers is large enough. Fig. 6a shows in black where the two-color model does apply, and in white where the priors derived from this model cannot be utilized. In these cases, a different kind of prior, e.g., a gradient prior, must be used. (Joshi et al., 2009) suggest to generally combine both a sparse gradient prior and the two-color model (where applicable) with a reduced regularization factor for the former.

The histograms of the negative log-likelihoods in Fig. 7 illustrate the effect of the alpha prior penalty term on the distribution of alpha values. Both example images have been initially deconvolved with a sparse prior ($\lambda_\nabla = 2, \gamma = 0.5$) before enabling the two-color model ($\lambda_\alpha = 5$ for the first image, and $\lambda_\alpha = 100$ for the second which amplifies the effect for illustration purposes; $\lambda_d = 0$). The red line shows the distribution after the initial sparse prior deconvolution. The blue and green lines show the distribution after 1, respective 2, further IRLS iterations with the now active alpha prior, while retaining sparse prior regularization. The grey line, in comparison, illustrates how the final distribution would have looked like if the alpha prior was never activated. Note how the shown distributions have a shape similar to the ones from Fig. 2c, which is because the k-means only algorithm without EM refinement was used here to construct the color model. In comparison with the prior on distances $d^*_a$, the alpha prior is more effective. Both penalty terms require surprisingly large regularization factors, especially compared to the parameters mentioned by (Joshi et al., 2009).

In Fig. 10, we show the effects of different amounts of regularization by $\lambda_\alpha$. The color noise in the right Fig. 10c might indicate too few iterations with the sparse prior before the first color model was built by EM clustering.

4.2 Qualitative Evaluation

We show exemplarily qualitative results in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9, whereby the second example is an image of much less texture than the first image, and also it has much more noise added. Therefore the quality metrics show better values for the second example. Another reason for that can be found in the different blur kernels which are shown in Fig. 4. The second example is convolved with a PSF that has a weaker ridge along its motion path with only two anchor points, whereas the first example has a PSF with a stronger ridge that is equally thick along its whole motion path. Therefore, the first PSF mixes more pixels and it is more ill-posed to deconvolve. On the other hand, the second PSF mixes two locally aggregated clusters of pixels (due to its two main anchor points) which are separated relatively far from each other. It can be seen in both cases that the Gaussian prior performs better than Richardson-Lucy, although it does not even conform with the real kurtotic model of the gradient distribution. The Gaussian prior was only justified because it is inexpensive to compute. But still its smoothing capabilities successfully reduce noise and hence outperform Richardson-Lucy. As expected, the Laplacian prior performs a little better but at the cost of much higher computation time. The sparse prior is in most cases an enhancement over the Laplacian, and as shown, even sub-optimal parameters tend to give good results. The color prior again adds more computational costs, but only minor improvements can be visually recognized, like some sharper edges and slightly reduced color noise, in the results of Fig. 8. The quantitative metrics are even a little worse when the color prior is enabled. The border effects in the deconvolution results are common artifacts.
Figure 7: Effects of the alpha and distance penalty terms on images of Fig. 4g and Fig. 4d.

(a) Ground truth image  
(b) Synthetically blurred image  
(c) Richardson-Lucy  
MSSIM 0.455, PSNR 18.37 dB  
(d) Gaussian prior: $\gamma = 2$, $\lambda = 8$  
MSSIM 0.560, PSNR 20.43 dB  
(e) Laplacian prior: $\gamma = 1$, $\lambda = 2$  
MSSIM 0.605, PSNR 20.88 dB  
(f) Sparse prior: $\gamma = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1$  
MSSIM 0.618, PSNR 20.87 dB  
(g) Sparse prior: $\gamma = 0.5$, $\lambda = 2$  
MSSIM 0.585, PSNR 20.49 dB  
(h) Color prior:  
$\gamma = 0.5$, $\lambda = 2$, $\lambda_a = 5$, $\lambda_d = 5$  
MSSIM 0.602, PSNR 20.79 dB  
(i) Cropped details, 4x enlarged

Figure 8: Deconvolution of the image of Fig. 4c with ground truth kernel and noise level $\sigma = 5\%$. 
Figure 9: Deconvolution of the image of Fig. 4h with ground truth kernel and noise level $\sigma = 1%$.

Figure 10: Deconvolution of the image of Fig. 4c with fixed $\sigma = 2.5\%$, $\lambda_\gamma = 2$, $\lambda_d = 0$ but varying $\lambda_\alpha$. 
which (Zhou et al., 2014) claims to reduce.

5 Context-adaptive Sparse Prior

Our experiments with the sparse priors suggest that these tend to oversmooth the result image if the chosen regularization factor $\lambda$ is too large, and on the other hand produce a noisy result image if $\lambda$ is too small. We therefore suggest a variable regularization that can adapt to local image structure. This would allow the user to have more control over the trade-off between regularization blur and noise, by choosing a stronger regularization in locally smooth image regions where blur does not cause so much trouble, and a weaker regularization in highly structured areas (at the cost of introducing noise at these locations). We experimentally study manual adaptation with user intervention. The idea is to provide the user with either the blurry image or, if the blur is too strong to be able to recognize regions of salient structure, a rough estimate of the deblurred image from the first IRLS iteration. The user can then paint over the edges and other structured areas of the image to indicate weaker regularization, as illustrated in Fig. 11a. The lines painted by the user can then be blurred slightly using a Gaussian filter to make the change in regularization less abrupt. The resulting image is then inverted and a threshold is introduced so that the sketched areas also experience a certain minimum amount of regularization (e.g. at least 25% regularization in comparison to areas where the user has indicated no important structure). This leads to an edge map like the one shown in Figure 11b. The intensities resulting from this edge map are then added as additional weights (multipliers) $\lambda \nabla k,i$ to the penalty terms $\rho \nabla (d_{k,i})$. The results shown in Fig. 11 are encouraging. Recently, (Cui et al., 2014) proposed a similarly adaptive regularization approach as an extension to Richardson-Lucy which is reported to successfully reduce ringing artifacts.

6 Conclusion

On the basis of the work by (Levin et al., 2007b) and their hyper-Laplacian penalty term, an extensible software framework for deconvolution using the IRLS method has been developed. Because regular photographs contain more than just intensity information, a further regularization approach based upon the two-color model proposed by (Joshi et al., 2009) has been re-implemented and integrated into our optimization framework. In the evaluation part, we proposed suitable values for the presented penalty terms. Finally, our experimental work showed that further context-adaptive regularization of gradient priors seems promising in avoiding over-smoothing. The presented method is robust in terms of image noise but performs poorly in case the blur kernel is not perfectly estimated (Zhong et al., 2013).

REFERENCES


Dong, W., Feng, H., Xu, Z., and Li, Q. (2012a). Blind


