DeepLSR: Deep learning approach for laser speckle reduction
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We present a deep learning approach for laser speckle reduction (’DeepLSR’) on images illuminated with a multi-wavelength, red-green-blue laser. We acquired a set of images from a variety of objects illuminated with laser light, both with and without optical speckle reduction, and an incoherent light-emitting diode. An adversarial network was then trained for paired image-to-image translation to transform images from a source domain of coherent illumination to a target domain of incoherent illumination. When applied to a new image set of coherently-illuminated test objects, this network reconstructs incoherently-illuminated images with an average peak signal-to-noise ratio and structural similarity index of 36 dB and 0.91, respectively, compared to 30 dB and 0.88 using optical speckle reduction, and 30 dB and 0.88 using non-local means processing. We demonstrate proof-of-concept for speckle-reduced laser endoscopy by applying DeepLSR to images of ex-vivo gastrointestinal tissue illuminated with a fiber-coupled laser source. For applications that require speckle-reduced imaging, DeepLSR holds promise to enable the use of coherent sources that are more stable, efficient, compact, and brighter than conventional alternatives.

Imaging with laser illumination offers many advantages over incoherent light due to the small étendue, narrow bandwidths, robust stability, long lifetimes, and fast triggering capabilities of laser sources. However, imaging with coherent illumination results in constructive and destructive interference between emitted wavefronts that produces speckle artifacts. To mitigate this source of noise, several optical methods for laser speckle reduction have been explored [1]. Broadening the spectral width of a laser source decreases its coherence length and modestly reduces speckle artifacts. A more common approach is to acquire an image that contains many uncorrelated speckle patterns, either by averaging several images or by randomizing the speckle quickly relative to the detector integration time. Recently, this approach was commercialized in a laser speckle reducer that resonantly vibrates diffusers using an electroactive polymer [2].

However, these approaches add cost and complexity, results in lost power, places fundamental limitations on imaging speed, and does not fully remove speckle.

In addition to optical speckle reduction methods, image processing techniques for speckle reduction and image denoising have been developed. These algorithms initially focused on probabilistic signal processing models with methods such as wavelet filtering, non-local means (NLM) filtering, and the statistical point estimation [3–5]. Shallow neural networks have been explored to determine filtering parameters for speckle reduction in optical coherence tomography [6]. The recent success of deep neural networks in regression and classification tasks has sparked interest in data-driven models for image denoising. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have been applied to general image denoising problems [7], but have not been de-
Developed specifically to reduce speckle noise, we present the application of a Deep CNN for Laser Speckle Reduction (‘DeepLSR’). By training on registered pairs of images with and without speckle noise, we develop a data-driven model that targets and removes laser speckle artifacts.

Most existing, learning-based noise reduction methods rely on per-pixel classification or regression with a structured and hand-crafted loss. Despite the use of structured losses, these methods treat the output image as unstructured since each pixel is conditionally independent from all other pixels for a given input image. In this work, conditional Generative Adversarial Networks (cGANs) are used for noise reduction by posing the problem as an image-to-image translation task where a structured loss is learned during the training process [8]. The overall architecture involves training a generator and a discriminator, given a conditional input. The generator and a discriminator are trained simultaneously with competing losses. While the generator learns to generate realistic mapping from an input image to an output image, the discriminator classifies pairs of input and generated output images as real or fake. The discriminator then provides feedback on the quality of the fake image to the generator. The objective of the generator is not to just fool the discriminator but to also be close to the ground truth output.

We used a generator with a 256 × 256-pixel encoder-decoder network with skip connections (U-Net) [9] and a discriminator that classifies on a patch level rather than on the entire image [Figure 1]. Both the generator and discriminator use standard modules of the form Convolution→BatchNorm→ReLu. The discriminator only penalizes structures at a patch level, preventing it from learning from large regions of the image [10]. Ground truth similarity was enforced by introducing an $\ell_1$ minimization term to the objective function between the predicted image and the ground truth. To prevent mode collapse, patches were pooled and fed to the discriminator in batches rather than individual images in each iteration. Spectral normalization was used to stabilize GAN training when learning simultaneously from assorted objects and tissue [11]. If $x$ is the input image and $y$ is the output image, $z$ is a random noise vector, $G$ is the generator and $D$ is the discriminator, the overall objective function can be written as,

$$\arg \min_G \arg \max_D L_{cGAN}(G, D) + \lambda L_1(G),$$

where $L_{cGAN}(G, D)$ represents the cGAN loss function and $L_1(G)$ represents the $\ell_1$ regularization term. Adding the $\ell_1$ loss does not change the role of the generator but encourages the output to be close to the ground truth without blurring. The two components of the overall objective can be defined as:

$$L_{cGAN}(G, D) = \mathbb{E}_{x, y}[\log D(x, y)] + \mathbb{E}_{x, z}[\log(1 - D(x, G(z)))]$$

$$L_1(G) = \mathbb{E}_{x, y}[|| y - G(x, z) ||_1].$$

The problem was solved using ADAM for stochastic optimization [12]. Further details about the generator and discriminator architectures can be found in [13]. A plot of generator and discriminator loss versus epoch are reported in the supplement (Visualization 1).

To train the DeepLSR network, data was acquired from i.) 100 assorted household and laboratory objects picked to represent a wide range of textures, shapes, and bidirectional reflectance distribution functions and ii.) 85 regions of ex-vivo porcine esophagus, intestine, and stomach from three animals.

Incoherent illumination was provided by a 1W white-light LED (Adafruit; BL-HP20AWCL). Coherent illumination was provided by a laser unit with either 445nm, 520nm, and 638nm diodes (Opt lasers microRGB) or 450nm, 532nm, and 650nm diodes (Aixiz RGB); multiple laser sources with different coherence lengths were used to increase the diversity of speckle seen by the network during training. Each laser unit was focused to a spot on an Optical Laser Speckle Reducer (oLSR, Optotune LSR-3005-24D). The diverging output from the oLSR was then

Fig. 2. Representative images comparing speckle noise of objects illuminated with coherent (Laser), speckle-reduced (oLSR), and incoherent illumination (LED). Speckle is more significantly reduced by DeepLSR than by median or non-local means filtering.
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collimated and coupled into a multimode fiber optic bundle. A diverging lens was placed at the output of the fiber bundle to match the full-width at half maximum of the LED’s illumination profile. The oLSR was toggled on and off for imaging with and without speckle reduction. The fiber bundle and LED were aimed at the object, placed below a color, 8-bit CMOS detector (ThorLabs, DCC3240C, 12mm/F1.8) with an integration time set to 25 ms for objects and 50 ms for porcine tissue. The illumination intensities between laser and LED were matched using pulse width modulation to achieve the same average pixel value when imaging a white piece of paper.

Networks were trained to learn the transformation from coherent to incoherent illumination (Laser → LED), optically-speckle-reduced to incoherent (oLSR → LED), and coherent to optically-speckle-reduced (Laser → oLSR). The 185, 1.3-megapixel images were resized from 1280 × 1024 to 1024 × 1024. Each image was then split into 16, 256 × 256 patches making 2960 patches per image set. 336 patches (160 patches from 10 assorted objects, 176 patches from a porcine tissue) were removed from each dataset for final network testing. The objects imaged for testing were not seen in the training set and similarly the porcine tissues imaged for testing came from a different animal than the images used for training.

The network was trained for 300 epochs using 2624 image patches. The learning rate was set to 0.0002 for the first 150 epochs and linearly decayed to a learning rate of zero over the remaining 150 epochs. The size of the image buffer that stores generated images was set to 64. The networks were implemented using PyTorch 0.4 and the training was run on Nvidia P100 GPUs using Google Cloud. The average training time for each epoch was 0.81 min and the entire network was trained in approximately 4 hours. Once the training process is complete, the trained network computes speckle-reduced images at 14 frames per second on a virtual workstation with 4 CPUs on a 2.6 GHz Intel Xeon E5 processor and 44 frames per second when using a P100 GPU.

To quantify the performance of DeepLSR, we measured the peak signal-to-noise (PSNR) ratio and structural similarity index (SSIM) using the incoherent, speckle-free image as the target. PSNR assesses the relative noise of an image and was computed using,

$$PSNR = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{R^2}{MSE} \right)$$

where $R$ is the detector’s bit depth of 255 and $MSE$ is the mean squared error between images. SSIM has been shown to be a valuable metric for image comparison using quantities that are important for human perception (image contrast, luminance, and structure) [14], and was computed using,

$$SSIM(x, y) = \frac{(2\mu_x\mu_y + C_1)(2\sigma_{xy} + C_2)}{\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + C_1^2}\frac{(2\sigma_{xy} + C_2)}{(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + C_1^2)}$$

where $x$ and $y$ are images for comparison, the image mean is $\mu$, variance is $\sigma$ , covariance between $x$ and $y$ is $\sigma_{xy}$, and the constant $C$ is added for avoiding instability when the denominator is close to 0. Average image SSIM was calculated using windows of 11 × 11 pixels. The result SSIM index is a value between −1 and 1, where an index of 1 indicates equivalent image inputs.

The three trained networks were tested on the reserved test images of assorted objects [Figure 2]. Prior to metric calculations, the histogram of each test was adjusted with respect to the corresponding target image using uniform histogram matching to correct for white-balancing discrepancies. The average PSNR and SSIM between the network-estimated images and the ground truth images are reported in Table 1. For performance benchmarks, we report PSNR and SSIM comparisons for laser vs. LED, oLSR vs. LED, and laser vs. oLSR. We also compared DeepLSR to standard image processing denoising techniques: median filtering and non-local means [15, 16]. The input parameters for these algorithms were optimized using the same training data set as was used for DeepLSR. The input parameters for these algorithms were optimized using the same training data set as was used for DeepLSR. Median filter kernel sizes of 7 and 5 were determined to be optimal for random objects and porcine tissue, respectively. An NLM kernel size of 4, window sizes of 3 and 5, as well as filter strengths of 0.217 and 0.286 were utilized for random objects and porcine tissue, respectively.

Our validation test demonstrates that image translation networks can generate speckle-reduced images with better PSNR and SSIM than conventional optical and image processing methods. Surprisingly, we found no benefit when transforming from an image with optical speckle reduction to incoherent illumination (oLSR → LED). We also observed effective transformation from a high-speckle image to a reduced-speckle image (Laser → oLSR).

To assess the effect of DeepLSR on resolution, images of a 1951 United States Air Force Resolution Target (Edmund Optics, 53-714) were acquired and processed with the DeepLSR network (Laser → LED). The modulation transfer function (MTF) was measured using the slanted edge of the target’s largest element with the Slanted Edge MTF plugin available for ImageJ [17]. Transfer functions from 8 regions for both DeepLSR and LED images were averaged and are reported in Figure 3. Comparing the spatial frequency at which each MTF reached half-modulus, DeepLSR reduced the spatial resolution by approximately 13% compared to LED illumination. Importantly, no images of a resolution target were used in the training of the DeepLSR network.

![Fig. 3. Modulation transfer functions from a slanted edge with LED illumination and DeepLSR.](Image 332x92 to 559x202)

<p>| Table 1. EVALUATION WITH ASSORTED TEST OBJECTS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Ground Truth</th>
<th>PSNR (dB)</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser*</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oLSR*</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepLSR (Laser → LED)</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oLSR → LED</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local Means</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Filtering</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser*</td>
<td>oLSR*</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser → oLSR</td>
<td>oLSR*</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Raw Data
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For tissue imaging, the object of interest is often a turbid medium that naturally blurs speckle artifacts. To assess the applicability of DeepLSR within these constraints, we applied our model to gastrointestinal tissue [Table 2]. Figure 4 shows a representative sample of the test images with laser illumination, DeepLSR (Laser → LED), and LED illumination. Like the assorted objects, the DeepLSR network removed speckle artifacts while retaining structural features better than conventional imaging processing approaches.

The robustness and generalizability of DeepLSR would improve with increased quantity and variety of training data. Large data sets would also allow for the development of a network that can be applied to a full-resolution image instead of patches, eliminating the stitching artifacts seen in recompiled images. Additionally, training data with a larger variety of laser sources, working distances, and imaging lens parameters will improve the generalizability of DeepLSR. To minimize the required quantity of manually captured data, a forward model may be utilized to generate synthetic data with varying speckle size, wavelengths, and small perturbations to prevent the network from learning shape and object texture. Moreover, future work with unsupervised networks may extend the DeepLSR approach to applications where images with and without speckle noise can be obtained but not registered.

DeepLSR may be particularly useful in endoscopic applications, where it is critical to transmit high power illumination light through small-area fiber bundles. In applications that require coherent light, such as laser speckle contrast imaging for mapping flow, DeepLSR may be applied to obtain both a computational image and a conventional widefield image simultaneously [18]. Another application that may benefit from DeepLSR is automated quality inspection of products in a factory setting, where remote lighting and bright sources with long lifetimes are required. Lastly, DeepLSR may prove useful in applications that require coherent illumination, such as optical coherence tomography, by generating paired image datasets with conventional approaches and speckle-reduction techniques [19].

In this Letter, we demonstrate that deep learning can be applied for laser speckle artifact reduction with improved PSNR and SSIM performance when compared to optical speckle reduction and conventional image processing techniques. Unlike other deep learning-based noise reduction methods, DeepLSR does not require a handcrafted loss function — the adversarial training framework learns a minimized loss between the DeepLSR output and the LED ground truth. Contrary to median and NLM processing methods, DeepLSR considers large portions of the image’s distribution. This allows deep learning to predict the most effective spatial relationships instead of considering only individual pixels to maintain resolution while reducing speckle.

The DeepLSR network is available at github.com/faisalml/DeepLSR
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Table 2. EVALUATION WITH PORCINE TISSUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Ground Truth</th>
<th>PSNR (dB)</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser*</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oLSR*</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepLSR (Laser → LED)</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oLSR → LED</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local Means</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Filtering</td>
<td>LED*</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Raw Data

Fig. 4. DeepLSR applied to images of ex vivo porcine colon.
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