arXiv:1306.2466v1 [math.NA] 11 Jun 2013

A VARIATIONAL ALGORITHM FOR THE DETECTION OF LINE SEGMENTS

Elena Beretta

Dipartimento di Matematica
Piazzale A. Moro 2
00183 Roma, Italy

Markus Grasmair

Computational Science Center, University of Vienna
Nordbergstrasse 15, 1090 Wien, Austria
and
Catholic University Eichstätt–Ingolstadt
Ostenstrasse 26, 85072 Eichstätt, Germany

Monika Muszkieta

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, Wroclaw University of Technology
ul. Wybrzeze Wyspianskiego 27, 50-370 Wroclaw, Poland

Otmar Scherzer

Computational Science Center, University of Vienna
Nordbergstrasse 15, 1090 Wien, Austria
and
Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM)
Austrian Academy of Sciences
Altenbergerstrasse 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria

Abstract. In this paper we propose an algorithm for the detection of edges in images that is based on topological asymptotic analysis. Motivated from the Mumford–Shah functional, we consider a variational functional that penalizes oscillations outside some approximate edge set, which we represent as the union of a finite number of thin strips, the width of which is an order of magnitude smaller than their length. In order to find a near optimal placement of these strips, we compute an asymptotic expansion of the functional with respect to the strip size. This expansion is then employed for defining a (topological) gradient descent like minimization method. As opposed to a recently proposed method by some of the authors, which uses coverings with balls, the usage of strips includes some directional information into the method, which can be used for obtaining finer edges and can also result in a reduction of computation times.

1. Introduction

Detection of edges, that is, points in a digital image at which the image intensity changes sharply is one of the most often performed steps in image processing. Ideally, the algorithm employed for solving this problem should provide a set of connected curves that indicate the edges of objects. In a recent paper [9], three of the authors have developed an iterative algorithm for edge detection using the concept of topological asymptotic analysis. The basic idea of this approach is to cover the expected edge set with balls of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and use the number of balls, multiplied with 2ε, as an estimate for its length. It was shown that under certain condition the proposed variational model approximates the Mumford–Shah functional [12] in the sense of Γ–limits, and, therefore, this algorithm may be considered as a computational method for the approximate minimization of the Mumford–Shah functional.

A criterion for the optimal positioning of balls covering the edge set is provided by the leading term of a topological asymptotic expansion of the approximating functional. The (iterative) implementation of the algorithm selects edges successively according to certain rules. In a follow up paper [7], it was shown that this approach is useful for scale detection of edges.

In this paper, we consider again the problem of edge detection in the framework of topological asymptotic analysis. As opposed to the previous work, however, we consider now covering the edge set with *line segments* rather than with balls. There are several reasons: First, edges should rather be seen as a union of small line segments than as accumulations of points. Second, numerically, the resulting algorithm is expected to be faster, as in each iteration step a whole set of edge points (the segment) is detected and not a single point only. We admit here that there is still a conceptual misfit between the continuous formulation and the discrete setting. Theoretically, by our analysis, only edge segments can be detected that display a certain distance from the previously detected ones (this will be reflected in the constant δ_0 below). We believe that this technical problem can in fact be solved, but it seems that this requires a much more sophisticated analysis of the topological expansion. In fact, for practical realizations, it is not a severe restriction, since the distance can, theoretically, be chosen arbitrarily small, in particular below half of the pixel size, in which case the union of line segments appears closed. However, compared to [9] the effect is less pronounced, because the covering line segments are relatively larger than the balls.

The novelty of this paper is an algorithm for edge detection based on the asymptotic analysis for topological derivatives with respect to line segments. We note that the topological asymptotic expansion in [9] has been derived in the framework of potential theory [13]. However, in the present case, due to the more complex geometry of the inhomogeneities and the impossibility of introducing a uniform scaling, this approach fails. To avoid these difficulties, in this paper we build up on a geometry independent approach of Capdeboscq & Vogelius [3, 4]. To outline our method, we have to introduce some notation first.

Let Ω be an open and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$. We assume that a given image $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded function that assigns to each point $x \in \Omega$ some gray value $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1.1. We denote by

$$\sigma_\varepsilon(y,\tau) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,:\, x = y + \rho\tau\,,\ -\varepsilon \le \rho \le \varepsilon\} \tag{1}$$

a line segment of length $2\varepsilon > 0$ centered at $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and with the unit tangent vector $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Moreover, we define a thin strip around $\sigma_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$ as

$$\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,:\, \operatorname{dist}(x, \sigma_\varepsilon(y,\tau)) \le \varepsilon^2\}\,. \tag{2}$$

If $K \subset \Omega$ is a closed subset and $0 < \kappa < 1$, we define the function $v_K\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$v_K(x) := \begin{cases} \kappa & \text{if } x \in K, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

In particular, we will apply this notion if K is the union of strips $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$. Finally, for every $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ we define

$$m_\varepsilon(v) := \inf\Big\{|S| : S \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1,\ v = v_K \text{ with } K = \bigcup_{(y,\tau)\in S} \omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)\Big\}\,. \tag{4}$$

Here we set $m_\varepsilon(v) := +\infty$, if $v \neq v_K$ for every finite subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ with $K = \bigcup_{(y,\tau)} \omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$.

With this notation at hand, we introduce the functional

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u,v) := \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (u-f)^2\,dx + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_\Omega v|\nabla u|^2\,dx + 2\beta\varepsilon\, m_\varepsilon(v)\,, \tag{5}$$

which is to be minimized over all functions $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Here α and β are some positive parameters.

For the approximate numerical minimization of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ we use a topological asymptotic expansion. Defining

$$\mathcal{J}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (u-f)^2\,dx + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_\Omega v|\nabla u|^2\,dx\,,$$

we see that for general $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau) \cap K = \emptyset$ we have

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u, v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)}) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\hat{u}, v_K) = \mathcal{J}(u, v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)}) - \mathcal{J}(\hat{u}, v_K) + 2\beta\varepsilon\,.$$

Thus the largest decrease of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ with respect to a strip $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$ can as well be found by optimizing $\mathcal{J}$ with respect to y and τ. Let now K be some subset of Ω; in particular, it can be the union of a finite number of thin strips. Now assume that we cut out a small strip $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$ of $\Omega \setminus K$ and denote by v_K and $v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon} := v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)}$ the corresponding edge indicators. Denote moreover by u_K and $u_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon}$ the minimizers of the functionals $\mathcal{J}(\cdot, v_K)$ and $\mathcal{J}(\cdot, v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon})$, respectively. Our main result in Section 2 is the derivation of an expansion of the form

$$\mathcal{J}(u_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon}, v_{K\cup\omega_\varepsilon}) - \mathcal{J}(u_K, v_K) \approx -2\alpha(1-\kappa)\varepsilon^3 \mathcal{M}\nabla u_K(y)\cdot\nabla u_K(y)\,, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\kappa} n\otimes n + \tau\otimes\tau$ and n, τ are the unit normal and tangent vectors to the segment σ_ε, and the intersection of K and $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$ is empty. The above difference (6) is asymptotically valid whenever a strip is removed from the potential edge set and can be used for finding the points of Ω where we can expect the largest decrease of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ by removing small strips.

2. Asymptotic expansion

We assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is an open bounded smooth domain and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a given function in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. We define the functional

$$\mathcal{J}(u,v) := \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (u-f)^2\,dx + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_\Omega v|\nabla u|^2\,dx\,, \tag{7}$$

for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and the parameter $\alpha > 0$.

Now assume that K is a fixed open subset of Ω and define the function $v\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \kappa & x \in K, \\ 1 & x \in \Omega\setminus\overline{K}, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

with $0 < \kappa < 1$. Using standard results of calculus of variations, one can show that the unique minimizer $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ of $\mathcal{J}(\cdot, v)$ is the unique weak solution to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} u - \alpha\,\mathrm{div}(v\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

In the remainder of this section, we will derive a variation of the functional $\mathcal{J}$ with respect to perturbation of the function v obtained by adding a small strip to the set K. More precisely, let us denote by L_0 a compact subset of $\Omega \setminus \overline{K}$ such that

$$\mathrm{dist}\,(L_0, \partial\Omega \cup \overline{K}) \geq \delta_0 > 0.$$

Let $y \in \operatorname{int}(L_0)$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that the thin strip $\omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau)$ defined as in (2) is contained in L_0. From now on, in order to simplify the notation, we set

$$\omega_\varepsilon := \omega_\varepsilon(y,\tau) \text{ and } \sigma_\varepsilon := \sigma_\varepsilon(y,\tau).$$

We define the function $v_\varepsilon \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$v_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \kappa & x \in K \cup \omega_\varepsilon, \\ 1 & x \in \Omega \setminus (\overline{K} \cup \overline{\omega_\varepsilon}). \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Similarly as above, we note that the unique minimizer $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega)$ of $\mathcal{J}(\cdot, v_\varepsilon)$ is the unique weak solution to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} u_\varepsilon - \alpha \operatorname{div}(v_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dfrac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Our goal is to establish an expansion for $\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u,v)$ in powers of ε as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *We have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \max_{y \in L_0} \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^3} \left| \mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u,v) - \frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2} 4\varepsilon^3 \mathcal{M} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla u(y) \right| = 0\,,$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\kappa} n \otimes n + \tau \otimes \tau$ and n, τ are the unit normal and unit tangent vectors to the segment σ_ε.

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we will follow the approach of Capdeboscq & Vogelius [3, 4]. We will need the set

$$\hat{L}_0 := L_0 + \overline{B_{\delta_0/2}(0)},$$

which is constructed in such a way that it satisfies

$$L_0 \subset \hat{L}_0 \subset \Omega \setminus \bar{K} \text{ and } \operatorname{dist}(\hat{L}_0, \partial\Omega \cup \overline{K}) \geq \delta_0/2,$$

and several auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. *The following identity holds:*

$$\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u,v) = \frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx. \tag{12}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Since u_ε and u are weak solutions of (9) and (11) they satisfy, respectively,

$$\int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - f)\phi + \alpha v_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \phi \in H^1(\Omega), \tag{13}$$

$$\int_\Omega (u - f)\phi + \alpha v \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \phi \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{14}$$

Setting $\phi = u$ in (13) and $\phi = u_\varepsilon$ in (14) and subtracting (14) from (13) we get

$$\int_\Omega f(u_\varepsilon - u)\, dx = \alpha(1-\kappa) \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, inserting $\phi = u_\varepsilon$ in (13) and $\phi = u$ in (14), we obtain, respectively,

$$\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - f) + \alpha v_\varepsilon |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx = 0\,, \tag{16}$$

$$\int_\Omega u(u - f) + \alpha v |\nabla u|^2 \, dx = 0\,. \tag{17}$$

Now

$$2(\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u, v)) = \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - f)^2 + \alpha v_\varepsilon |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx - \int_\Omega (u - f)^2 - \alpha v |\nabla u|^2 \, dx$$

and, by (16) and (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u, v)) &= \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - f)^2 - (u_\varepsilon - f)u_\varepsilon - (u - f)^2 + (u - f)u \, dx \\ &= -\int_\Omega f(u_\varepsilon - u) \, dx \, . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recalling (15), the claim follows. □

Lemma 2.3. *The function u satisfies*

$$u \in C^{1,\lambda}(L_0) \tag{18}$$

for every $0 < \lambda < 1$. Moreover there exists a constant $C = C(\delta_0, \Omega)$ such that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(L_0)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \tag{19}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3. First we observe that, in $\Omega \backslash \overline{K}$, u solves

$$u - \alpha \Delta u = f.$$

Now, let $\tilde{x} \in L_0$ and let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ be a function with a compact support in L_0 such that $\varphi(x) \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood U of $\tilde{x}$. Since $u - f$ is bounded, we get that $w = (u - f)\varphi \in L^p(L_0)$ for all $p < +\infty$, and therefore, $\Delta^{-1} w \in W^{2,p}(L_0)$ for all $p < +\infty$. In particular we have that $u \in W^{2,p}(U)$ for all $p < +\infty$. From the Sobolev imbedding theorem and since $\tilde{x} \in L_0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $u \in C^{1,\lambda}(L_0)$ with $\lambda \in (0, 1 - 2/p)$ for $2 < p < +\infty$. Moreover from [11] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{2,p}(L_0)} &\leq C(\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq C(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \end{aligned}$$

for any $p > 2$ and where C depends on δ_0, Ω. Finally the Sobolev imbedding theorem implies (19). □

We now derive energy estimates for $u_\varepsilon - u$.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a constant $C = C(\kappa, \delta_0)$ such that*

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})|\omega_\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{20}$$

and

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})|\omega_\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}+\eta} \tag{21}$$

for some $\eta > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Subtracting (14) from (13) we get

$$\int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u)\phi + \alpha v_\varepsilon \nabla(u_\varepsilon - u) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = \alpha(1 - \kappa) \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Omega) \, .$$

Setting $\phi = u_\varepsilon - u$, inserting it in the last equality and applying Schwarz' inequality, we get

$$\alpha\kappa \|u_\varepsilon - u\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \alpha(1 - \kappa)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\omega_\varepsilon)} \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Hence

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1 - \kappa}{\kappa} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\omega_\varepsilon)}$$

and by Schwarz' inequality and the regularity estimates proved in Lemma 2.3 for u we derive

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})|\omega_\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} \, .$$

To prove (21) we subtract (13) from (14) getting

$$\int_\Omega (u-u_\varepsilon)w+\alpha v\nabla(u-u_\varepsilon)\cdot\nabla w\,dx = \alpha(\kappa-1)\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla w\,dx \quad \forall w\in H^1(\Omega). \tag{22}$$

Let $w\in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} w-\alpha\,\mathrm{div}(v\nabla w)=u-u_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial\nu}=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

Since $w-\alpha\Delta w=u-u_\varepsilon$ in $\hat L_0$, by interior regularity results (cf. [8, Thm. 8.8]) we have

$$\|w\|_{H^2(\hat L_0)}\le C(\|u-u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}).$$

Moreover since

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le C\|u-u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

we have that

$$\|w\|_{H^2(\hat L_0)}\le C\|u-u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

By the Sobolev imbedding theorem, the last inequality implies that $\nabla w\in L^p(\hat L_0)$ for any $p\in(1,+\infty)$ and

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\hat L_0)}\le C\|u-u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Let us now choose $q\in(1,2)$ and p so that $\frac1p+\frac1q=1$. Then, combining the variational formulation of the problem (23) with (22) and applying Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega (u-u_\varepsilon)^2\,dx &= \alpha(\kappa-1)\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla w\,dx\\ &\le C\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\omega_\varepsilon)}\|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\omega_\varepsilon)}\\ &\le C\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\omega_\varepsilon)}\|u-u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

and since $\frac1q>\frac12$ the claim follows. □

We recall here a general, geometry independent, result due to Capdeboscq & Vogelius (cf. [3, 4]). Let us indicate with $V^j:=x_j-\frac{1}{|\partial\Omega|}\int_{\partial\Omega}x_j\,d\sigma$, $j=1,2$, the so called corrector terms. Let

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(x)=\begin{cases}\kappa & x\in\omega_\varepsilon,\\ 1 & x\in\Omega\backslash\overline{\omega_\varepsilon},\end{cases} \tag{25}$$

and let V^j_ε, $j=1,2$, be the solutions to

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(\gamma_\varepsilon\nabla V^j_\varepsilon) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\,,\\ \dfrac{\partial V^j_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu} &= \nu_j \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega\,,\\ \int_{\partial\Omega}V^j_\varepsilon\,d\sigma &= 0\,. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

Proceeding with similar arguments as in Lemma 2.4 one easily sees that there exists a constant $C=C(\kappa,\delta_0)$ such that

$$\|V^j_\varepsilon-V^j\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le C|\omega_\varepsilon|^{\frac12} \tag{27}$$

and

$$\|V^j_\varepsilon-V^j\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le C|\omega_\varepsilon|^{\frac12+\eta} \tag{28}$$

for $j=1,2$ and for some $\eta>0$. Observe now that, as $\varepsilon\to0$,

$$|\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1}1_{\omega_\varepsilon}(\cdot) \text{ converges in the sense of measure to } \mu \tag{29}$$

and the Borel measure μ is concentrated on L_0. In fact, due to the form of the set ω_ε, it is immediate to see that $\mu = \delta_y$, where δ_y denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at y. Using (27) and from the analysis in [3] it follows that, possibly up to the extraction of a subsequence,

$$|\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} 1_{\omega_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial V_\varepsilon^j}{\partial x_i}(\cdot) \text{ converges in the sense of measure to } \mathcal{M}_{ij} \text{ when } \varepsilon \to 0\,, \tag{30}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ is a Borel measure with support in L_0. Again, the fact that the set ω_ε shrinks to the point y implies that the measure $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ is simply a multiple of δ_y. Hence, identifying $\mathcal{M}_{ij}$ with $\mathcal{M}_{ij}\delta_y$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij}\phi(y) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{|\omega_\varepsilon|} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial V_\varepsilon^j}{\partial x_i}(x)\phi(x)\,dx \tag{31}$$

for every smooth function ϕ. Following [3] it is possible to show the following result:

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\varepsilon \to 0$ be such that (29) and (30) hold. Then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_\Omega 1_{\omega_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\phi\,dx = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(y)\mathcal{M}_{ij}\phi(y) \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^1(\hat{L}_0) \tag{32}$$

for any $j = 1, 2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. From the energy estimates we have that, possibly extracting a subsequence that we do not relabel,

$$|\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} 1_{\omega_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}(\cdot) \text{ converges in the sense of measure to } \bar{\nu}_j, \tag{33}$$

that is,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\phi\,dx = \int_\Omega \phi\,d\bar{\nu}_j$$

for all continuous function ϕ in Ω. In order to prove (32) we will prove the following relation for $\varepsilon \to 0$

$$|\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u \cdot \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \phi\,dx = |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla V^j \phi\,dx + o(1), \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^1(\hat{L}_0). \tag{34}$$

Once (34) is proved, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get

$$\int_\Omega \phi\,d\bar{\nu}_j = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(y)\mathcal{M}_{ij}\phi(y) \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^1(\hat{L}_0),$$

from which (32) follows.

Hence let us prove (34). Let us notice that, if $\phi \in C_0^1(\hat{L}_0)$, then $\phi v_\varepsilon = \phi\gamma_\varepsilon$ and $\phi v = \phi\gamma_0 = \phi$, and we have

$$\int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - f)\phi + \alpha\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\phi\,dx = \int_\Omega (u - f)\phi + \alpha \nabla u \cdot \nabla\phi\,dx \tag{35}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot \nabla\phi\,dx = \int_\Omega \nabla V^j \cdot \nabla\phi\,dx. \tag{36}$$

Using (35) and (36) and after some algebraic manipulations we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha \int_\Omega (1-\gamma_\varepsilon)\nabla u \cdot \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \phi\,dx - \alpha \int_\Omega (1-\gamma_\varepsilon)\nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla V^j \phi\,dx \\
&= \alpha \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla(V_\varepsilon^j \phi) - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot \nabla(U\phi)\,dx - \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla V^j \cdot \nabla(u_\varepsilon\phi) - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla(V^j\phi))\,dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla u \cdot V_\varepsilon^j \nabla\phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot u\nabla\phi)\,dx + \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla V^j \cdot u_\varepsilon \nabla\phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot V^j \nabla\phi)\,dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \alpha \int_\Omega (\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla(V_\varepsilon^j \phi) - \nabla V^j \cdot \nabla(u\phi))\, dx + \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u) V_\varepsilon^j \phi \, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega (\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot \nabla(u_\varepsilon \phi) - \nabla u \cdot \nabla(V^j \phi))\, dx - \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u) V^j \phi \, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla u \cdot V_\varepsilon^j \nabla \phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot u \nabla \phi)\, dx + \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla V^j \cdot u_\varepsilon \nabla \phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot V^j \nabla \phi)\, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u)(V_\varepsilon^j - V^j)\phi \, dx + \alpha \int_\Omega (\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot V_\varepsilon^j \nabla \phi - \nabla V^j \cdot u \nabla \phi)\, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega (\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot u_\varepsilon \nabla \phi - \nabla u V^j \cdot \nabla \phi)\, dx - \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla u \cdot V_\varepsilon^j \nabla \phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot u \nabla \phi)\, dx \\
&\quad + \alpha \int_\Omega (\nabla V^j \cdot u_\varepsilon \nabla \phi - \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot V^j \nabla \phi)\, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u)(V_\varepsilon^j - V^j)\phi \, dx + \alpha \int_\Omega \nabla V^j \cdot (u_\varepsilon - u) \nabla \phi \, dx - \alpha \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot (V_\varepsilon^j - V^j) \nabla \phi \, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla V_\varepsilon^j \cdot (u_\varepsilon - u) \nabla \phi \, dx + \alpha \int_\Omega \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot (V_\varepsilon^j - V^j) \nabla \phi \, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u)(V_\varepsilon^j - V^j)\phi \, dx + \alpha \int_\Omega \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla (u_\varepsilon - u) \cdot (V_\varepsilon^j - V^j) \nabla \phi \, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_\Omega \gamma_\varepsilon \nabla (V_\varepsilon^j - V^j) \cdot (u_\varepsilon - u) \nabla \phi \, dx + \alpha \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} (\kappa - 1) \nabla u \cdot (V_\varepsilon^j - V^j) \nabla \phi \, dx \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} (\kappa - 1) \nabla V^j \cdot (u_\varepsilon - u) \nabla \phi \, dx \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, by Lemma 2.4, (27), (28), Schwarz inequality and using finally the regularity of u and of V^j we get (34) and the claim follows. □

We now state several properties of the polarization tensor $\mathcal{M}$ established in [3, 4] that we will use in the sequel. From the definition of the tensor $\mathcal{M}$ given in [1], it is easy to see that it is symmetric and satisfies

$$
|\xi|^2 \le \mathcal{M}\xi \cdot \xi \le \frac{1}{\kappa} |\xi|^2 \tag{37}
$$

for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover

$$
\operatorname{tr} \mathcal{M} \le 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \,, \tag{38}
$$

$$
\operatorname{tr} \mathcal{M}^{-1} \le 1 + \kappa \,. \tag{39}
$$

Furthermore, in the case of constant coefficients by insertion of $\phi = \xi_i \xi_j$ in (31) we get

$$
\mathcal{M}_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j = |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla V_\varepsilon \cdot \xi \, dx + o(1) = |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla V_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla V \, dx + o(1) \,, \tag{40}
$$

where $V_\varepsilon = V_\varepsilon^i \xi_i$ and $V = V^i \xi_i$. Hence, we can write

$$
\mathcal{M}\xi \cdot \xi = |\xi|^2 + |\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla W_\varepsilon \cdot \xi \, dx + o(1) \,, \tag{41}
$$

where $W_\varepsilon = V_\varepsilon - V$ is the solution to

$$
\begin{cases}
\operatorname{div}(\gamma_\varepsilon \nabla W_\varepsilon) = \operatorname{div}((1-\kappa) 1_{\omega_\varepsilon} \xi) & \text{in } \Omega \,, \\
\gamma_\varepsilon \dfrac{\partial W_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \,.
\end{cases} \tag{42}
$$

We are now ready to prove the following result:

Proposition 1. *We have*

$$\mathcal{M}\tau\cdot\tau=1,\qquad \mathcal{M}n\cdot n=\frac{1}{\kappa}. \tag{43}$$

Proof of Proposition 1. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\tau=e_1=(1,0)$ and $n=e_2=(0,1)$ are the standard basis vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Let us set $\xi=\tau=e_1$ and denote by W^1_ε the corresponding solution of (42). We will first show that

$$|\omega_\varepsilon|^{-1}\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\cdot e_1\,dx=o(1). \tag{44}$$

Let $\omega_\varepsilon{}'=\{x+\rho e_2 : x\in\sigma_\varepsilon,\ -\varepsilon^2\le\rho\le\varepsilon^2\}$ and let us write

$$\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\cdot e_1\,dx=\int_{\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\cdot e_1\,dx+\int_{\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\cdot e_1\,dx:=I_1+I_2\,.$$

Observe that

$$|I_2|\le\|\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}|\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'|^{1/2}\,,$$

and by the energy estimates

$$|I_2|\le|\omega_\varepsilon|^{1/2}|\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'|^{1/2}=o(|\omega_\varepsilon|)\,.$$

Let us now estimate I_1

$$|I_1|=\left|\int_{-\varepsilon^2}^{\varepsilon^2}\int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}\frac{\partial W^1_\varepsilon}{\partial x_1}\,dx_1dx_2\right|=\left|\int_{-\varepsilon^2}^{\varepsilon^2}W^1_\varepsilon|_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}\,dx_2\right|\,.$$

Observe now that by standard regularity results

$$\|W^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\varepsilon)}\le C(\|W^1_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}+\|1_{\omega_\varepsilon}e_1\|_{L^q(\omega_\varepsilon)})$$

for $q>2$. Hence

$$\|W^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\omega_\varepsilon)}\le C|\omega_\varepsilon|^{1/q}$$

and if $q\in(2,3)$ we get

$$|I_1|=o(|\omega_\varepsilon|).$$

Summarizing

$$\left|\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla W^1_\varepsilon\cdot e_1\,dx\right|\le|I_1|+|I_2|=o(|\omega_\varepsilon|)\,,$$

which proves (44). Finally, inserting (44) in (41) and letting $\varepsilon\to0$,

$$\mathcal{M}e_1\cdot e_1=1.$$

Recalling (38) and (39) we get that

$$\mathcal{M}e_2\cdot e_2=\frac{1}{\kappa}.$$

□

We are now ready to prove our main result:

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\omega_\varepsilon{}'$ be defined as in the proof of Proposition 1. Then, by Lemma 2.2, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon,v_\varepsilon)-\mathcal{J}(u,v)&=\frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2}\int_{\omega_\varepsilon}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u\,dx\\&=\frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2}\int_{\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u\,dx+\frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2}\int_{\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u\,dx\,.\end{aligned}$$

Observe now that

$$\int_{\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla u_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u\,dx=\int_{\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'}\nabla(u_\varepsilon-u)\cdot\nabla u\,dx+\int_{\omega_\varepsilon\setminus\omega_\varepsilon{}'}|\nabla u|^2\,dx\,.$$

Using Schwarz inequality, the regularity estimates of Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 we get

$$\left| \int_{\omega_\varepsilon \setminus \omega_\varepsilon'} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx \right| \leq C(\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} |\omega_\varepsilon \setminus \omega_\varepsilon'|^{1/2} + |\omega_\varepsilon \setminus \omega_\varepsilon'|) \leq C|\omega_\varepsilon \setminus \omega_\varepsilon'| = o(|\omega_\varepsilon|)\,.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u,v) = \frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx = \frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon'} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx + o(|\omega_\varepsilon|).$$

Let us choose some vector function $\Phi \in C_0^0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{cases} \nabla u & x \in L_0, \\ 0 & x \in \Omega \setminus \hat{L}_0. \end{cases} \tag{45}$$

Then, from Lemma 2.5 we get

$$|\omega_\varepsilon'|^{-1} \int_{\omega_\varepsilon'} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u \, dx \to \mathcal{M} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla u(y)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Observing that $|\omega_\varepsilon'| = 4\varepsilon^3$ we get

$$\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u,v) = \frac{\alpha(\kappa-1)}{2} 4\varepsilon^3 \mathcal{M} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla u(y) + o(\varepsilon^3)\,.$$

Finally, observing that the remainder term is uniformly bounded with respect to $y \in L_0$, i.e., $|o(\varepsilon^3)| \leq C\varepsilon^{3+\eta}$ for some $\eta > 0$ and C and η depend only on $\kappa, \delta_0, \|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}, \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ and ∇u is continuous on the compact set L_0 the claim follows. □

3. Numerical Implementation

We now propose two variants of an algorithm to edges detection that is based on the expansion derived above, which states that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_{K \cup \omega_\varepsilon}) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u, v_K) \approx 2\beta\varepsilon - 2\alpha(1-\kappa)\varepsilon^3 \mathcal{M} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla u(y) \tag{46}$$

with $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\kappa} n \otimes n + \tau \otimes \tau$. For fixed $y \in \Omega$, the right hand side in (46) is minimal for τ equal to the unit vector perpendicular to $\nabla u(y)$ in which case

$$\mathcal{M} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla u(y) = \frac{1}{\kappa} |\nabla u(y)|^2$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_{K \cup \omega_\varepsilon}) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u, v_K) \approx 2\beta\varepsilon - 2\alpha\varepsilon^3 \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa} |\nabla u(y)|^2.$$

As a consequence, we can expect a decrease of the function $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ in case

$$|\nabla u(y)|^2 \geq \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$$

and the decrease is maximal at points y where the gradient of u is maximal.

(1) Our first algorithm computes a smoothed version u_s of the input image f a-priori, and then finds, using only the smoothed image u_s, a sequence of edge indicators $K^{(k)}$, where $K^{(k+1)}$ is formed from $K^{(k)}$ by the addition of a strip $\sigma_\varepsilon(x^{(k)}, \tau^{(k)})$ for which the expected decrease in the approximated functional $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ from (5) is maximal. Theorem 2.1 indicates that, as long as we only add strips that are away from $K^{(k)}$, this is the case if $x^{(k)}$ is chosen such that $|\nabla u(x)|$ is maximal and $\tau^{(k)} = (\nabla u(x^{(k)}))^\perp$. However, because the asymptotic expansion of Theorem 2.1 is only valid away from $K^{(k)}$, we have to restrict the search for a maximum of $|\nabla u|$ to some set $L^{(k)}$ which is compactly contained in $\Omega \setminus K^{(k)}$. For instance, one can set $L^{(k)} := \Omega \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup K^{(k)} + B_\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$; a different construction,

which we have used in the numerical examples, is described below. The iteration is stopped when the expected decrease of the gradient term in the functional is compensated by the increase in the edge term. This is the case when $|\nabla u(x^{(k)})|^2 < \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$. This method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Data: input image $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, parameters α, $\beta > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < \kappa < 1$;
Result: edge indicator set K;

Initialization: set $K = \emptyset$ and $L = \Omega \setminus (\partial\Omega + B_\delta)$

compute the solution u of

$$\begin{cases} u - \alpha \operatorname{div}(\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

repeat
  find $x^* \in L$ with $|\nabla u(x^*)|$ maximal;
  compute a strip σ_ε of size ε centered at x^* with normal $\nabla u(x^*)$;
  set $K \leftarrow K \cup \sigma_\varepsilon$;
  compute an enlargement S of σ_ε;
  set $L \leftarrow L \setminus S$;
until $|\nabla u(x^*)|^2 < \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$;

Algorithm 1: Implementation without updates of the smoothed function

In fact this algorithm is an anisotropic edge detector, which take into account edge magnitudes and local edge orientations.

(2) In our second algorithm, we combine updates of the edge indicator with updates of the smoothed function u: After adding a fixed number $n_{\max}$ of strips to the edge set K, we define the new diffusivity v by

$$v(x) := \begin{cases} \kappa & \text{if } x \in K, \\ 1 & \text{if } x \notin K, \end{cases}$$

and then compute a corresponding smoothed function u, which is then used for selecting the next at most $n_{\max}$ strips in the edge set. The process of alternating between the addition of strips and updates of the smoothed function u is repeated until no more admissible points $x \in L$ exist for which $|\nabla u(x)|^2 \geq \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$.

The rationale behind this idea is the fact that the expansion derived above, though still valid, becomes increasingly inaccurate as the number of added strips becomes larger. Therefore, at some point some reinitialization is necessary. Note, however, that the number $n_{\max}$ of strips that are added in each iteration mainly determines the computation time, as the computation of u is the most costly part of the algorithm. Thus the number $n_{\max}$ should not be chosen too small. In the numerical implementations, we chose $n_{\max}$ in such a way that approximately 10 computations of u were needed.

The resulting method is described in Algorithm 2.

Solution of the PDE. For the numerical solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} u - \alpha \operatorname{div}(v\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

we have implemented a finite element method using bilinear ansatz functions on a rectangular grid for u and piecewise constant ansatz functions on the same grid for

Data: input image $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, parameters $\alpha,\ \beta > 0,\ \varepsilon > 0,\ 0 < \kappa < 1$, $n_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$;
Result: edge indicator function v, smoothed image u;
Initialization: set $v(x) = 1$ for $x \in \Omega$, $K = \emptyset$, and $L = \Omega \setminus (\partial\Omega + B_\delta)$;
compute the solution u of

$$\begin{cases} u - \alpha \operatorname{div}(\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega; \end{cases}$$

repeat
  set $n = 1$;
  repeat
    find $x^* \in L$ with $|\nabla u(x^*)|$ maximal;
    compute a strip σ_ε of size ε centered at x^* with normal $\nabla u(x^*)$;
    set $K \leftarrow K \cup \sigma_\varepsilon$;
    compute an enlargement S of σ_ε;
    set $L \leftarrow L \setminus S$;
    set $n \leftarrow n + 1$;
  until $n > n_{\max}$ *or* $|\nabla u(x^*)|^2 < \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$;
  set $v(x) = \kappa$ for $x \in K$;
  compute the solution u of

$$\begin{cases} u - \alpha \operatorname{div}(v\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega; \end{cases}$$

until $\max_{x^* \in L} |\nabla u(x^*)|^2 < \frac{\beta\kappa}{\alpha\varepsilon^2(1-\kappa)}$;

Algorithm 2: Implementation with updates of u




FIGURE 1. Sketch of the construction of the set σ_ε and the corresponding enlarged set S

the diffusivity v. The solution of the resulting linear equation was computed with the CG method.

Update of the Edge Indicator. For updating the edge indicator set K (and the function v), we have to find maximizers of $|\nabla u|$. We restrict the search to midpoints of the rectangular elements E_k of the finite elements and evaluate the gradient on the elements analytically.



FIGURE 2. *Upper left:* Original Image. *Upper right:* Result with Algorithm 1. *Lower left:* Result with Algorithm 2. *Lower right:* Result using the Algorithm from [9]. In all examples, the parameters were $\alpha = 8$ and $\beta = 150$.



FIGURE 3. Close up view on a detail of Figure 2. *Left:* Result with Algorithm 1. *Middle:* Result with Algorithm 2. *Right:* Result with the method from [9]. Note in particular the thick edges in the last image.

Assume now that the maximum of $|\nabla u|$ is attained at y^*. For the update of the set L we define the enlargement S of Σ_ε as a rectangle of side-lengths 2ε and 2δ for some $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ around the center-line of the strip. That is, (see Figure 1)

$$S := \{y : \mathrm{dist}(y_k, \sigma_\varepsilon) \leq \delta \text{ and } |(y - y_k) \cdot \nabla u(y_k)^\perp| \leq \varepsilon |\nabla u(y_k)|\}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. In the numerical experiments below we have chosen $\varepsilon = 3h$ and $\delta = 2h$ with h being the pixel distance.

Numerical Experiments. We have tested the two algorithms proposed above using the *Parrots* image (see Figure 2, upper left). In addition, we provide a comparison with the results of the algorithm proposed in [9], where balls instead of strips are used for covering the edge set.



FIGURE 4. Close up view of the lower part of the beak of the first parrot in Figure 2. *First:* Original image. *Second:* Result with Algorithm 1. *Third:* Result with Algorithm 2. *Fourth:* Result with the method from [9]. One clearly sees the spurious edges in the first segmentation and the thick edge in the third segmentation, which is partly resolved in the second one.

While, generally speaking, the positions of the detected edges do approximately agree for the different algorithms, the actual form of the edges may significantly differ. Thus the algorithm of [9] results in thick edges, which do not appear in the results from the strip based methods. This difference is due to the fact that the directional information present in the strips allows the exclusion of laterally neighboring pixels from further considerations. In contrast, the balls that are used for edge covering in [9] do not allow a similar exclusion of pixels.

Concerning computation times, Algorithm 1 is clearly faster than Algorithm 2, as the main computational effort of the methods lies in the solution of the PDE, which has to be computed several times in the case of Algorithm 2. We do note, however, that Algorithm 1 introduces artifacts in the form of parallel edges, which can be clearly seen in the close up view of the parrot's head in Figure 3 and 4. These false edge detections can be attributed to the smearing out of edges occurring in the first solution of the PDE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) within the national research network Photoacoustic Imaging in Biology and Medicine, project S10505-N20, and Variational Methods on Manifolds, project S11704. OS wants to thank Yves Capdeboscq for stimulating discussions. The work was initiated during a special semester at MSRI in 2010 and finished during a special semester at Mittag-Leffler in 2013; the hospitality of MSRI and Mittag-Leffler is gratefully acknowledged.

APPENDIX — Γ-CONVERGENCE

In the following we show, similarly as in [9], that the functional $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ defined in (5) Γ-converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\kappa \to 0$ to the Mumford-Shah functional $\mathcal{F}\colon L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \to [0, +\infty]$, defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(u,v) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2}\displaystyle\int_\Omega (u-f)^2\,dx + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{\Omega\setminus S_u} |\nabla u|^2\,dx + \beta\mathcal{H}^1(S_u) & \text{if } v \equiv 1\,, \\ +\infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{47}$$

Here S_u denotes the discontinuity set of the function u (see [2]).

We do stress that, in contrast to the rest of the paper, where κ was constant, it is necessary for obtaining any non-trivial Γ-convergence result that this parameter tends to zero much faster than the size ε of the covering strips. Thus the following theorem can be interpreted as saying that the minimizers of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ are close to minimizers of the Mumford–Shah function, if both parameters ε and κ are close

to zero. The asymptotic expansion derived in Theorem 2.1, however, relies on κ being bounded away from zero; the constant in the $O(\varepsilon^3)$ expansion tends to $+\infty$ as $\kappa \to 0$.

Theorem. *Assume that* $\kappa(\varepsilon) = o(\varepsilon^2)$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$. *Then,*

$$\mathcal{F} = \Gamma\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \ .$$

Proof. In order to prove the Γ-convergence result, we have to show that

$$\Gamma\text{-}\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \le \mathcal{F} \le \Gamma\text{-}\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon.$$

The proof of the lim inf-inequality is along the lines of [9]. Therefore we only prove the lim sup-inequality.

Following [9], we introduce the set $\mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ consisting of all functions $u \in \mathrm{SBV}(\Omega)$ for which the following hold:

(1) $\mathcal{H}^1(\overline{S}_u \setminus S_u) = 0$.
(2) The set $\overline{S}_u$ is the union of a finite number of almost disjoint line segments contained in Ω, that is, their pairwise intersections are either empty or contain a single point.
(3) $u|_{\Omega\setminus\bar{S}_u} \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega \setminus S_u)$.

This set has been shown to be dense in $\mathrm{SBV}(\Omega)$ in the sense that, for every $u \in \mathrm{SBV}$, there exists a sequence $(u_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ such that $\|u_j - u\|_{L^2} \to 0$ and $\mathcal{F}(u_j) \to \mathcal{F}(u)$ (see [5, 6]).

Now assume that $u \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. In the following, we will construct sequences $u^\varepsilon \to u$ and $v^\varepsilon \to 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{F}(u, 1).$$

Because of the aforementioned density of $\mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ and the fact that $\mathcal{F}(u, v) = +\infty$ for $v \neq 1$, this will prove the lim sup-part.

Because $u \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$, there exists a finite number k of almost disjoint line segments $[a_i, b_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $S_u = \bigcup_{i=1}^k [a_i, b_i]$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{H}^1(S_u) = \mathcal{H}^1(\overline{S}_u) = \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i - a_i| \ .$$

Now choose a minimal number of points $y_j^{(i)} \in [a_i, b_i]$, $j = 1, \dots, l_i$, in such a way that the union of the strips $\omega_\varepsilon\big(y_j^{(i)}, \frac{b_i-a_i}{|b_i-a_i|}\big)$ covers the set

$$K_i^\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \ : \ \mathrm{dist}(x, [a_i, b_i]) < \varepsilon^2\} \ .$$

This can be achieved with at most $1 + \frac{|b_i-a_i|}{2\varepsilon}$ points. Define

$$S_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{j=1}^{l_i} \omega_\varepsilon\big(y_j^{(i)}, \frac{b_i - a_i}{|b_i - a_i|}\big)$$

and let $v^\varepsilon := v_{S_\varepsilon}$. Noting that

$$\mathcal{L}^2(S_\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^2\big((2 + 2k\varepsilon)\mathcal{H}^1(S_u) + k\pi\varepsilon^2\big),$$

we see that $v^\varepsilon \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover

$$m_\varepsilon(v^\varepsilon) \le \sum_{i=1}^k \Big(1 + \frac{|b_i - a_i|}{2\varepsilon}\Big) \le k + \frac{\mathcal{H}^1(S_u)}{2\varepsilon} \ ,$$

showing that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} 2\beta\varepsilon m_\varepsilon(v^\varepsilon) \le \beta\mathcal{H}^1(S_u) \ .$$

Define moreover

$$u^\varepsilon(x) := u(x) \min\Big(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x, S_u)}{\varepsilon^2}, 1\Big) .$$

Then Lebesgue's theorem of dominated convergence implies that $u^\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, and therefore

$$\int_\Omega (u^\varepsilon - f)^2 \, dx \to \int_\Omega (u - f)^2 \, dx \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0 .$$

Moreover, $\nabla u^\varepsilon(x) = \nabla u(x)$ for $x \notin K^\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \operatorname{dist}(x, S_u) < \varepsilon^2\}$, and

$$|\nabla u^\varepsilon(x)| \le |\nabla u(x)| + \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty}}{\varepsilon^2} \text{ for almost every } x \in K^\varepsilon .$$

This implies that

$$\int_\Omega v^\varepsilon |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \, dx \le \int_{\Omega \setminus K^\varepsilon} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + 2\kappa(\varepsilon) \int_{K^\varepsilon \setminus S_u} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2}{\varepsilon^4} \, dx .$$

Because

$$\mathcal{L}^2(K^\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^2 \big(2\mathcal{H}^1(S_u) + k\pi\varepsilon^2\big)$$

and $\kappa(\varepsilon) = o(\varepsilon^2)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, this shows that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_\Omega v^\varepsilon |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \, dx \le \int_{\Omega \setminus S_u} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \, dx .$$

Together, these estimates imply that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon) \le \mathcal{F}(u, 1) ,$$

which, because of the density of $\mathcal{W}(\Omega)$, in turn proves that

$$\mathcal{F} \ge \Gamma\text{-}\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon .$$

□

References

[1] E. Beretta, Y. Capdeboscq, F. de Gournay, and E. Francini. Thin cylindrical conductivity inclusions in a three-dimensional domain: a polarization tensor and unique determination from boundary data. *Inverse Probl.*, 25(6):065004, 22, 2009.

[2] A. Braides. *Approximation of free-discontinuity problems*, volume 1694 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[3] Y. Capdeboscq and M.S. Vogelius. A general representation formula for boundary voltage perturbations caused by internal conductivity inhomogeneities of low volume fraction. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 37(1):159–173, 2003.

[4] Y. Capdeboscq and M.S. Vogelius. Pointwise polarization tensor bounds, and applications to voltage perturbations caused by thin inhomogeneities. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 50(3-4):175–204, 2006.

[5] G. Cortesani. Strong approximation of GSBV functions by piecewise smooth functions. *Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez. VII (N.S.)*, 43:27–49 (1998), 1997.

[6] G. Cortesani and R. Toader. A density result in SBV with respect to non-isotropic energies. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 38(5, Ser. B: Real World Appl.):585–604, 1999.

[7] G. Dong, M. Grasmair, S. H. Kang, and O. Scherzer. Scale and edge detection with topological derivatives of the Mumford-Shah functional. In A. Kuijper, editor, *SSVM'13: Proceedings of the fourth International Conference on Scale Space and Variational Methods in Computer Vision*, volume 7893 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 404–415, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer-Verlag.

[8] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Reprint of the 2nd ed. Springer, 2001.

[9] M. Grasmair, M. Muszkieta, and O. Scherzer. An approach to the minimization of the Mumford–Shah functional using Γ-convergence and topological asymptotic expansion. To appear in *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 2013.

[10] Y. M. Jung, S. H. Kang, and J. Shen. Multiphase image segmentation via Modica-Mortola phase transition. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 67(5):1213–1232, 2007.

[11] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and N. N. Ural′tseva. *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations*. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica, Inc. Translation editor: Leon Ehrenpreis. Academic Press, New York, 1968.

[12] D. Mumford and J. Shah. Optimal approximations by piecewise smooth functions and associated variational problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 42(5):577–685, 1989.

[13] M. S. Vogelius and D. Volkov. Asymptotic formulas for perturbations in the electromagnetic fields due to the presence of inhomogeneities of small diameter. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 34(4):723–748, 2000.