An Optimized Union-Find Algorithm for Connected Components Labeling Using GPUs
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Abstract—In this paper, we report on an optimized union-find (UF) algorithm that can label the connected components on a 2D image efficiently by employing GPU architecture. The proposed method comprises three phases: UF-based local merge, boundary analysis, and link. The coarse labeling in local merge, which makes computation efficient because the length of the label-equivalence list is sharply suppressed. Boundary analysis only manages the cells on the boundary of each thread block to launch fewer CUDA threads. We compared our method with the label equivalence algorithm [1], conventional parallel UF algorithm [2], and line-based UF algorithm [3]. Evaluation results show that the proposed algorithm speeds up the average running time by around 5x, 3x, and 1.3x, respectively.

I. INTRODUCTION

Connected components labeling (CCL) is a task to give a unique ID to each connected region in a 2D/3D grid, which means that the input data is divided into separate groups where the elements from a single group share the same ID. As a basic data clustering method, it is employed in numerous research areas like image processing, computer vision, and visual communication [4]. W. Song, et al. [5] presented a motion based skin region of interest detection method using a real-time CCL algorithm to reduce its execution time. A fast 3D shape measurement technique using blink-dot projection patterns that utilizes a CCL algorithm to compute the size and location of each dot on the captured images has been reported [6] [7]. P. Guler, et al. proposed a real-time multi-camera video analytics system [8] employing CCL to perform noise reduction.

On the basis of the fact that parallel devices find countless applications in both industrial and academic areas, some CCL algorithms using GPUs have emerged [9] recently to improve the real-time property of CCL, which is very important for many applications. The CCL algorithms can be classified into two categories, the multi-pass method and one-pass method, according to whether they apply a convergence criterion or not [10]. Tab. I summarizes five typical parallel CCL approaches and a brief explanation is given in the following. Neighbor propagation [1] is the simplest multi-pass approach that scans the neighborhood of a target cell to get the lowest label of a neighboring cell belonging to the same group. Row-column unification [11] enlarges the scan scope by allocating one row to each thread. Label equivalence [1] employs neighbor propagation as the first phase to construct label-equivalence chains, and the following analysis and relabeling phases find the roots of each chain. The resolution of an input image determines the iteration times of neighbor propagation, while the iteration of row-column unification and label equivalence depend on the complexity of an input image. The usual union-find (UF) algorithm [12] is parallelized by dividing the input image into independent 2D blocks; local merge and global merge are introduced to solve the connectivity [2]. Instead of using 2D blocks, a line-based parallel UF algorithm [3] collects the pixels in one row to perform local label unification. Even the computation of each kernel in such one-pass methods is heavier than those of multi-pass approaches; they label an image faster because each kernel only runs once time.

In this study, we propose an optimized UF algorithm that is an improved version of conventional parallel UF [2] with an optimized local merge and lightweight boundary analysis. Its concepts are: (1) row-column unification is performed using shared memory before local UF to reduce the complexity of an initialized local label map; (2) connectivity analysis is conducted only for the cells on the block boundary to decrease the number of required CUDA threads. Compared with the conventional UF [2], our proposed approach can perform local merge more efficiently because the label-equivalence chains are extensively suppressed as a result of the coarse labeling. For the line-based UF [3], it can extract the local label map slightly faster than our method. However, its global merge phase takes much longer because global UF should be applied to all the cells in the input data.

TABLE I: Classification of the parallel CCL algorithms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Scan Mode</th>
<th>Computational cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Propagation</td>
<td>Multi-Pass</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row-Column Unification</td>
<td>Multi-Pass</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label Equivalence</td>
<td>Multi-Pass</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional UF</td>
<td>One-Pass</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-based UF</td>
<td>One-Pass</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. ALGORITHM DESCRIPTION

In this section, we outline the three kernels of our method. In the first kernel, UF-based local merge, we perform a coarse labeling before finding the real root of each cell to reduce the computational complexity in each thread. In the last two kernels, boundary analysis and link, we merge individual blocks together to generate a global label map.

**Kernel 1 Local UF merge with coarse labeling**

Require: Image I of size $N \times M$

Require: Both block dimension and grid dimension are 2D

Require: $label_{sm}[i], dBuff_{sm}[i]$ are on shared memory

Require: $LabelMap$ is on global memory

1. declare int $x, y, tid, temp, l, g_x, g_y, g_l$
2. declare int $label_{sm}[i], dBuff_{sm}[i]$
3. $x, y \leftarrow 2D$ global thread id
4. if $x < imgWidth$ \&\& $y < imgHeight$
5. $tid \leftarrow 1D$ thread id within block
6. $label_{sm}[tid] \leftarrow tid$
7. $dBuff_{sm}[tid] \leftarrow image[x, y]$
8. call syncthreads()
9. // row scan
10. if $dBuff_{sm}[tid] \neq dBuff_{sm}[tid - 1]$
11. $label_{sm}[tid] \leftarrow label_{sm}[tid - 1]$
12. end if
13. call syncthreads()
14. // column scan
15. if $dBuff_{sm}[tid] \neq dBuff_{sm}[tid - blockdim.x]$
16. $label_{sm}[tid] \leftarrow label_{sm}[tid - blockdim.x]$
17. end if
18. call syncthreads()
19. // row-column unification
20. $temp \leftarrow tid$
21. while $temp > label_{sm}[temp]$
22. $temp \leftarrow label_{sm}[temp]$
23. $label_{sm}[tid] \leftarrow temp$
24. end while
25. // local union find
26. if $dBuff_{sm}[tid] \neq dBuff_{sm}[tid - 1]$
27. findAndUnion($label_{sm}[i], tid, tid - 1$)
28. end if
29. call syncthreads()
30. if $dBuff_{sm}[tid] \neq dBuff_{sm}[tid - blockdim.x]$
31. findAndUnion($label_{sm}[i], tid, blockDim.x$)
32. end if
33. call syncthreads()
34. // convert local index to global index
35. $l \leftarrow find(label_{sm}[i], tid)$
36. $l_x \leftarrow l / blockdim.x$
37. $l_y \leftarrow l \% blockdim.x$
38. $g_l \leftarrow (blockIdx.x * blockDim.x + l_x) + (blockIdx.y * blockDim.y + l_y) \times imgWidth$
39. $LabelMap[x, y] \leftarrow g_l$
40. end if

---

A. Local merge with coarse labeling

The first kernel, local merge with coarse labeling, consists of three phases: initialization, coarse labeling using row-column unification, and local UF. Its pseudo-code is listed in Kernel 1 by following 4-connectivity.

1) Initialization:

We divide the input image into several rectangular pieces, as shown in Fig. 1 (a), and assign each piece to different GPU threads blocks where the threads can cooperate with each other using shared memory and can be synchronized [13]. The cells in each block are indexed by the thread ID within the block. Fig. 1 (b) presents an example of an $8 \times 8$ initialized local label map that was allocated on shared memory. Here, the gray cells represent foreground areas, while the white cells represent background areas.

2) Coarse labeling using row-column unification:

In an initialized local label map, as shown in Fig. 1 (b), the label of the left cell and the label of the upper cell are always smaller than that of a target cell, while the upper one is always smaller than the left one. Based on this fact, we scan the rows first and then go to column scan. The cell will get the label of its neighboring cell, left or upper, with the same property. Fig. 2 shows the scan models. Unlike the methods that record the entire label-equivalence lists, this method records the lowest label that the label is equivalent to. Its memory access complexity is reduced due to the utilization of shared memory, while the equivalence can be unified by a low number of iteration because the dimension of a thread block is limited by the CUDA runtime system.
Require: LabelMap
Both block dimension and grid dimension are 2D after row-column unification.

Kernel 2 Boundary analysis

Require: Image I of size \(N \times M\)
Require: Both block dimension and grid dimension are 2D
Require: LabelMap\[\] is on global memory

1: declare int h_x, h_y, v_x, v_y, pInLine, p_b, p_v
2: declare bool b_h, b_v
3: id \leftarrow 1D global thread id
4: // convert 1D global thread id to 2D cell id
5: h_x \leftarrow id \% imgWidth
6: h_y \leftarrow id / (imgWidth * blockDim.y)
7: pInLine \leftarrow imgWidth / blockDim.x
8: v_x \leftarrow id \% pInLine * blockDim.x
9: v_y \leftarrow id / pInLine
10: p_h \leftarrow h_x + h_y * imgWidth
11: p_v \leftarrow v_x + v_y * imgWidth
12: b_h \leftarrow h_x < imgWidth & h_y < imgHeight
13: b_v \leftarrow v_x < imgWidth & v_y < imgHeight
14: // boundary analysis along x-axis
15: if b_h & image[h_x, h_y] == image[h_x - 1, h_y]
16: findAndUnion(LabelMap, p_h, p_h - 1);
17: end if
18: // boundary analysis along y-axis
19: if b_v & image[v_x, v_y] == image[v_x, v_y - imgWidth]
20: findAndUnion(LabelMap, p_v, p_v - imgWidth);
21: end if

3) Local UF:

UF, expressed by findAndUnion in Kernel 1, is a data structure that divides a set of elements into a number of disjoint subsets by using find and merge operations. The find is an iterative search to extract the root of a label-equivalence list and return its label. The merge is a unification to assign the root label to the elements belonging to the subset. 12 gives a detailed description of these two operations. By comparing the initialized local label map (Fig. 1(b)) with the one after row-column unification (Fig. 3(b)), it can be noticed that the path to find the root of a label-equivalence chain is compressed sharply, which enables local UF to run efficiently. The final step of this kernel is an ID conversion that converts the local index to a global index. Fig. 4(a) presents a converted global label map.

B. Boundary analysis

In the boundary analysis phase, we only perform UF for the cells on the block boundary (those marked in Fig. 4(a)) to launch fewer threads. Assuming the resolution of an input image is \(N \times M\) and the block configuration of the Kernel 1 is \(\{b_x, b_y, 1\}\), the number of cells on the block boundary along x-axis and y-axis \(\{P_x, P_y\}\) can be determined as follows:

\[
P_x = \lfloor N / b_x \rfloor \times M,
\]

\[
P_y = \lfloor M / b_y \rfloor \times N,
\]

Here, \(\lfloor x \rfloor\) means the largest integer smaller or equal to \(x\). To integrate the boundary analysis along \(x\)- and \(y\)-axis into one kernel, \(\max\{P_x, P_y\}\) threads spawned by Kernel 2 should be invoked. Fig. 4(b) shows how to analyze the connectivity in the \(x\)-direction: the cell on the boundary merges with its upper cell by using UF if they have the same property. The union along the \(y\)-direction works in the same manner.

C. Final link

After analyzing the connectivities of the cells on the block boundary, the independent local label maps are associated as
TABLE II: Execution time in millisecond for different images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>Line UF</th>
<th>ours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lena (512 × 512)</td>
<td>min 0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 1.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 0.73</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lena (1024 × 1024)</td>
<td>min 1.61</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 2.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 1.77</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lena (2048 × 2048)</td>
<td>min 5.13</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 5.65</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 5.38</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lena (4096 × 4096)</td>
<td>min 18.40</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 19.08</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 18.64</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppers (512 × 512)</td>
<td>min 0.78</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 1.51</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 0.97</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppers (1024 × 1024)</td>
<td>min 1.92</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 2.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 2.13</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppers (2048 × 2048)</td>
<td>min 6.02</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 6.47</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 6.25</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppers (4096 × 4096)</td>
<td>min 18.20</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max 22.24</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 18.79</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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