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$k$-means

## $k$-means

## k-means algorithm

The standard algorithm alternates between two steps until convergence: Given $k$ initial center points,
1 Assign each point to its closest center
2. Update each center to the centroid of the points assigned to it, where the centroid is the arithmetic mean.

## Derivation of $k$-means: Point Assignment

Theorem
If the centers are fixed, the best point to center assignment is to pick the closest center for each point.

## Proof.

Each point is independent, so consider an arbitrary point. If we don't pick the center closest to it, the distance will be greater. Thus, we pick the closest center.

## Derivation of $k$-means: Center Location

## Theorem

If the point to center assignment is fixed, then the best center placement is the centroid of the points assigned to it.

## Derivation of $k$-means: Center Location

## Proof.

We want to minimize the sum of squares distance:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \min _{\vec{y}} \sum_{i=0}^{n}\left\|\vec{y}-\vec{x}_{i}\right\|^{2} \\
& \quad=\sum(\vec{y}-\vec{x}) \cdot(\vec{y}-\vec{x}) \\
& \quad=\sum(\vec{y} \cdot \vec{y}-2 \vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}+\vec{x} \cdot \vec{x})
\end{aligned}
$$

## Derivation of $k$-means: Center Location

## Proof.

We now differentiate with respect to $\vec{y}$ and set equal to $\overrightarrow{0}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{n}\left(2 \vec{y}-2 \vec{x}_{i}\right) & =\overrightarrow{0} \\
2 n \vec{y} & =2 \sum \vec{x} \\
\vec{y} & =\frac{\sum \vec{x}}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Implications

- Point to center assignment relies on minimum distance
- Centroid relies on Euclidean distance
- Minimize norm of $\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}$
- Suppose we switch distance metrics
- Point assignment computation trivial
- Centroid computation nontrivial
- Need to differentiate, unlikely to get clean analytical solution
- Use numerical methods e.g. gradient descent
- Some metrics are very complicated/non-continuous or non-differentiable
- Hence, easier to switch spaces


## Uniform Color Spaces

- Projection from RGB
- Use Euclidean distance for distance
- Should "just work"
- Goal is perceptual uniformity i.e. MacAdam ellipses


## Uniform Color Spaces

## sRGB vs RGB

- RGB: "linear", e.g. adding intensities for greyscale
- Corresponds to voltage
- sRGB: nonlinear, based off actual monitor
- Corresponds to brightness, $L=V^{\gamma}$
- So we take $V$-> $V^{1 / r}$
- 8 -bit = only 256 colors
- Prioritize black for perceptual uniformity

Linear Gamma


## Y'UV

- $Y^{\prime}$ : brightness, U/V: color
- Matrix multiplication from RGB
- Which RGB?
- $Y^{\prime} U V$ is computed from RGB (linear RGB, not gamma corrected RGB or sRGB for example)
- Wait, but

```
return _convert(yuv_from_rgb, rgb)
```

```
kernel = ops.convert_to_tensor(
    _yuv_to_rgb_kernel, dtype=images.dtype, name='kernel')
ndims = images.get_shape().ndims
return math_ops.tensordot(images, kernel, axes=[[ndims - 1], [0]])
```

scikit-image
tensorflow

- In particular, catimg, scikit-image, and tensorflow do not gamma correct
- No one really knows


## Color Appearance Models

- CIECAM02/CAM16 are color appearance models
- That is, given XYZ (wavelengths) predict how color appears
- CAM16 output: Correlates of lightness J, chroma $C$, hue composition $H$, hue angle $h$, colorfulness $M$, saturation $s$, and brightness $Q$
- We want color space
- Luckily, uniform color space (UCS) variants
- J lightness, a red/green, b blue/yellow
- CIELAB basically


## Implementing the CAMs

- CIECAM02 and CAM16 have the same "body", just a different initial "color appearance transformation" (CAT)

Step 1: Calculate 'cone' responses

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
R \\
G \\
B
\end{array}\right)=\mathbf{M}_{16} \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
X \\
Y \\
Z
\end{array}\right)
$$

Step 2: Complete the color adaptation of the illuminant in the corresponding cone response space (considering various luminance levels and surround conditions included in $D$, and hence in $D_{\mathrm{R}}, D_{\mathrm{G}}$, and $D_{\mathrm{B}}$ )

- Thus, most efficient to subclass CAM
- Only difference is $M$ and $M^{-1}$

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
R_{\mathrm{c}} \\
G_{\mathrm{c}} \\
B_{\mathrm{c}}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
D_{\mathrm{R}} \cdot R \\
D_{\mathrm{G}} \cdot G \\
D_{\mathrm{B}} \cdot B
\end{array}\right)
$$

- CAMXY inherits methods from base CAM


## CAM Forward Implementation

```
def CAT(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    Linear transformation.
    # combines step 1: cone responses and step 2: color adaptation
    return mulv(self.M, c)
def CAM(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    """" Color appearance model after color appearance transform. """"
    # step 3: postadaptation cone response
    RGBp = tmap(lambda x: sign(x)*self.post(abs(x)), c)
    # step 4: color components a/b, hue angle h, auxililary variables pp2/L
    pp2, a, b, u = mulv(Mdot, RGBp)
    h = hue_angle(b, a)
    # step 5: eccentricity
    hp = h + (h < hue data[0] [0])*360
    for i in range(len(hue data) - 1):
        if hue_data[i][0] <= hp < hue_data[i + 1][0]:
        break
    et = 1/4*(cos(hp + deg(2)) + 3.8)
    hi, ei, Hi, h1, e1, H1 = hue_data[i] + hue_data[i + 1]
    H=Hi + 100*e1*(hp - hi)/(e1*(hp - hi) + ei*(h1 - hp))
    # PL, PR = round(H1 - H), round(H - Hi)
    A = pp2*self.Nbb # step 6: achromatic response
    ] = 100*(A/self.Aw)**(self.c*self.z) # step 7: correlate of lightness
    # step 8: correlate of brightness
    Q = 4/self.c*sqrt(J/100)*(self.Aw + 4)*self.FL**0.25
    # step 9: correlate of chroma C, colorfulness M, saturation 5
    t = 50000/13*self.Nc*self.Ncb*et*sqrt(a**2 + b**2)/(u + 0.305)
    alpha = t**0.9*(1.64-0.29**self.n)**0.73
    C = alpha*sqrt(J/100)
    M = C*self.FL**0.25
    s=50*sqrt(alpha*self.c/(self.Aw + 4))
    return (J, C, H, h, M, s, Q)
```


## CAM Inverse Implementation

```
def CAMinv(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    """. Reverse model of the color appearance transform. ""."
    J, _, _, h, M, _, _= c
    # step l: get J, t, and h
    C = M/self.FL**0.25
    alpha = 0 if J == 0 else C/(sqrt(J/100))
    t = (alpha/(1.64-0.29**self.n)**0.73)**(1/0.9)
    # step 2: et, A, pp1, pp2
    et = 1/4*(\operatorname{cos}(h+\operatorname{deg}(2))+3.8)
    A = self.Aw*(J/100)**(1/(self.c*self.z))
    pp1 = et*50000/13*self.Nc*self.Ncb
    pp2 = A/self.Nbb
    # step 3: a and b
    gamma = 23*(pp2 + 0.305)*t/(23*pp1 + 11*t*cos(h) + 108*t*sin(h))
    a, b = gamma*\operatorname{cos}(h), gamma*sin(h)
    RGBp = scale(mulv(Mdotinv, (pp2, a, b)), 1/1403) # step 4: RGBp
    RGBC = tmap(self.postinv, RGBp) # step 5: RGBC
    return RGBc
def CATinv(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    """" Undo the color appearance transformation. """.
    # combines step 6: RGB and step 7: X, Y, Z
    return mulv(self.Minv, c)
```


## Uniform Color Space

```
def from_xyz(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    """ XYZ to CAMXY color space. """
    return self.CAM(self.CAT(c))
def to_xyz(self, c: tuple) -> tuple:
    """
    return self.CATinv(self.CAMinv(c))
def to_ucs(self, c: tuple, c1: float=0.007, c2: float=0.0228) >> tuple:
    """
    J, , , , h, M, , - = c
    Jp,}\mp@subsup{,}{Mp}{-}=(1+100\mp@code{0
    return (Jp,Mp*\operatorname{cos(h),Mp*sin(h))}
def from_ucs(self, c: tuple, c1: float=0.007, c2: float=0.0228) -> tuple:
h'=h
a}=\mp@subsup{M}{}{\prime}\operatorname{cos}(h
    b}=\mp@subsup{M}{}{\prime}\operatorname{sin}(h
M'}=\operatorname{ln}(1+0.0228M)/0.022
    """ CAMXY-UCS to CAMXY color space. """
    Jp, ap,bp = c
    Mp, h = sqrt(ap**2 + bp**2), hue_angle(bp, ap)
    M, J = (exp(c2*Mp) - 1)/c2, Jp/(1 + c1*(100 - Jp))
    return (J, None, None, h, M, None, None)
```


## Qualitative Performance



## Qualitative Performance


(a) CIELAB

(f) CAM02-UCS

## Miscellaneous

## One Weird Trick Color Scientists DON'T Want You to Know: Lower Your STRESS By 17\%!

- Steven's power law: $S=a I^{b}$
- S: subjective magnitude, I: physical stimulus
- $\Delta E^{\prime}=a \Delta E^{b}$
- Kind of but not really
- STRESS: measure of color difference performance, lower is better
- Lowers STRESS by an average of $17 \%$
- Why does this work?
- $\quad b<1$ : compresses the space (small values -> larger, larger values -> smaller)
- Raters have difficulty with small values
- Also large values asymptote



## Color Conversion API

- Could hand-design
- 10 choose $2=45$
- Could have "central" color, e.g. XYZ
- CAM16 -> CAM16UCS
- CAM16 -> XYZ -> CAM16 -> CAM16UCS
- BFS from one space to the other
- Minimize \# of functions -> faster, less numerical error


## Color Difference

- Distance parameterized by (space, metric)
- e.g. (RGB, Euclidean) or (CIELAB, CIEDE2000)
- 8 spaces +3 metrics $=11$ possible!
- Power function for 6 -> 17 possible
- Can technically apply custom metrics on non-CIELAB
- Surprisingly, this kinda... works?


## Experimental Results

## ANSI Color Codes

- Image -> text
- catimq
- Some terminals support 3-byte "true color"
- Neither Vim's AnsiEsc nor Vim's Colorizer can render these
- Thus, have to use 255 color mode

a. original image

c. catimg 8-bit
b. catimg 24-bit "true color"


## The Algorithm



- Downscale image somehow (averaging window, bicubic, bilinear, etc.)
- Convert color to nearest ANSI color
- Find closest color!
- catimg uses YUV color space + Euclidean which explains the poor quality


## Downscaling

- Use ffmpeg
- Good
- Area (used by catimg)
- Experimental
- Okay
- Bilinear
- Gauss
- Bad
- Bicubic
- Neighbor
- Bicublin
- Sinc
- Lanczos
- Spline


## Downscaling

- full_chroma_int and full_chroma_inp don't seem to do anything
- Could use uniform color space for the averaging
- Makes very little difference


## Dataset

- Album cover of Nisemonogatari Gekihanongakushu (Original Soundtrack)
- Album covers are nice and square, low resolution (544x544)
- Colors reveal failure points



## Getting S



## Basics


"Perceptually Uniform" Spaces



## Distance Metrics


$k$-means

## Choosing k

- If $k$ too big, differences minor -> color space doesn't matter
- If $k$ too small, not much able to do -> also doesn't matter
- Need $k$ to be just right
- In this case, $k=32$
- Anime images are too easy, real life is better
- 131,707 distinct pixels versus 28,641: 4.6x difference


## Dataset \#2

- Album cover of Opportunity by Kana Hanazawa



## Basics



## Perceptually Uniform Spaces



|  | CIECAM02 | original | XYZ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## Conclusion

- Color perception != image quality
- Problems like this are really difficult
- Machine learning?


## Sources

- My implementation(s)
- Previous lecture: Color Theory, Part 1: Color Difference Metrics
- Check the sources in that presentation, not going to repeat!
- sRGB - Wikipedia
- Linear, Gamma and sRGB Color Spaces
- What's wrong with 8 -bit linear RGB?
- YUV - Wikipedia
- catimg YUV implementation
- scikit-image, tensorflow (tf.image)
- Delta E (CMC)
- Scaling - FFmpeg


## Sources

- Power functions improving the performance of color-difference formulas
- The CIECAM02 color appearance model
- Uniform Colour Spaces Based on CIECAM02 Colour Appearance Model
- Comprehensive color solutions: CAM16, CAT16, and CAM16-UCS
- Algorithmic improvements for the CIECAM02 and CAM16 color appearance models

