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Abstract: This paper presents SuPeR-B, a novel, Retinex inspired color spatial algorithm to enhance images acquired under difficult light conditions, such as pictures containing dark and bright regions caused by backlight and/or local, not diffused spotlight. SuPeR-B takes as input a color image and improves its readability by processing its color channels independently in accordance with some principles of the Retinex theory. Precisely, SuPeR-B re-works the channel intensity of each pixels accounting for differences computed both in the spatial and intensity domains. In this way, SuPeR-B acts as a bilateral filter. The experiments, carried out on a real-world dataset, shows that SuPeR-B ensures good enhancement results, also in comparison with other state-of-the-art algorithms: SuPeR-B improves the overall content of the image, making the dark regions brighter and more contrasted, while lowering possible chromatic dominants of the light.

1 INTRODUCTION

An image enhancer is an algorithm that improves the visibility of the content and of the details of an input image. Such an algorithm is particularly needed each time an image has been acquired under difficult light conditions, like low-light, back-light and/or multiple light sources, which cause noise, color distortions and strong shadows and make hard to understand what the image depicts. Improving the image quality is essential not only for human observers but also for all the machine vision algorithms requiring an accurate detail visibility, such as key-point detectors for robust and illumination invariant image/object recognition (Lecca et al., 2019). Many methods for enhancing pictures captured under bad illuminations have been proposed in the literature. Some examples are global and local image methods exploiting statistical analysis, e.g. (Zuiderveld, 1994), (Gianini et al., 2014), Retinex inspired algorithms and variants, e.g. (Morel et al., 2010), (Banić and Lončarić, 2013), (Lecca et al., 2018), (Lecca and Messelodi, 2019), (Banić and Lončarić, 2015), illuminance/reflectance decomposition approaches, e.g. (Guo et al., 2017), (Wang et al., 2013), (Fu et al., 2016), machine learning techniques, e.g. (Jiang et al., 2019), (Wei et al., 2018), (Lv et al., 2018), (Li et al., 2020).

Despite the huge efforts made till now, image enhancement is still an open issue. In fact, the most enhancers rely on specific hypotheses about illumination, reflectance and spectral properties of the acquisition device. These assumptions limit the enhancer applicability to specific contexts. For instance, many algorithms assume that the illumination varies slightly across the image, but this prevents the enhancement of images with abrupt changes of light, as for instance strong shadows. In this respect, the enhancement of images with very dark and very bright regions has been poorly investigated. These images are usually generated by capturing scenes with backlight or local, brilliant but not diffused spotlights (see fig. 1).

This work contributes to the state of the art on the enhancement of such images by presenting SuPeR-B, a novel spatial color algorithm obtained as a variant of the Retinex inspired image enhancer SuPeR (Lecca and Messelodi, 2019). Both SuPeR and SuPeR-B take as input a color image, process their channels separately, and partition each channel by regular, not overlapping tiles, which are treated as super-pixels and processed according to some principles of the Retinex theory. The acronym SuPeR comes from italic letters marked above. SuPeR rescales the intensity $I(x)$ of any pixel $x$ by a value, which is computed as the average of the tile maximum intensities greater than $I(x)$, where each intensity is weighted by a function inversely proportional to the distance...
Figure 1: Examples of images captured with backlight and with local, not diffuse spotlight and their versions enhanced by SuPeR-B ($\alpha = 0, a, b = -1$). In the backlight image (top, left), the subject is displayed against a brilliant sky and appears dark. In the spotlight image (top, right), the monitor of the notebook positioned in a dark room acts as a local, not diffused spotlight, that cannot illuminate sufficiently the near-by regions. In both the cases, the image content without enhancement is unreadable.

The resulting image is an enhanced version of the input one: it is brighter and more contrasted, has a lower color distribution entropy, while shadows and color casts possibly due to the light are smoothed or even removed. The experiments show that SuPeR provides an accurate image enhancement of the most of real-world, low-light images with very fast computational times, but its performance decreases in case of backlight and spotlight images. SuPeR-B (where 'B' stands for 'back-light' but also indicates that this is a second, improved version of SuPeR) overcomes this problem by implementing a novel function weighting the tile intensities involved in the enhancement of $I(x)$. This function, modeled by a Coon patch, accounts not only for the distance between the tile barycenters and $x$ but also for the amount of the difference between the tile maximum intensity and $I(x)$. In this way, SuPeR-B acts like a bilateral filter which processes pixelwise the image based both on intensity and spatial features, brightening dark regions within edge preservation. The experiments carried out on a dataset of real-world back-light and spotlight images show that SuPeR-B outperforms SuPeR as well as other algorithms at the state of the art, in particular the multi-scale Retinex algorithm (Petro et al., 2014), the channel-division approach (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012), the image fusion-based enhancer for single backlit images (Wang et al., 2016) and the learning based approach for image restoration (Li and Wu, 2018). In this framework, the performance of SuPeR-B have been evaluated by comparing the brightness, the contrast and the color distribution entropy of the test images before and after the enhancement. The results show that SuPeR-B increases the brightness and contrast, lowers the color distribution entropy and preserves the important edges, meaning that the enhanced image has more visible details and a more readable content than the input one.

2 RELATED WORK

The enhancement of images with dark and bright regions due to the light has been scarcely addressed in the literature. From the hardware point of view, the high dynamic range (HDR) devices attempt to deal with the root of the problem, by capturing multi-exposure images of the same scene and merging them via tone mapping functions in order to generate a high quality pictures. Nevertheless, the HDR tone mapping functions often introduce in the final image unpleasant distortions and artifacts, and thus they themselves are subject of current research. In addition, HDR imaging cannot solve the problem of enhancing an existing image where the light conditions hamper the visibility of the content of some regions.

The image enhancers working globally, such as histogram equalization, generally perform scarcely because they do not account for the variability of the light across the scene. Better performance is reached by spatial adaptive enhancers, such as many Retinex inspired algorithms. These latter basically process the image channels separately and re-work the channel intensity of each pixel $x$ based on the intensity (and sometimes also on other visual features like gradient) of pixels sampled from a neighborhood of $x$. The output image is brighter and more contrasted than the input one, possible shadows and color casts due to the illumination are smoothed or even removed, the dynamic range of the image is stretched. In other Retinex inspired algorithms, the local spatial information is modeled through a function of the distance of $x$ from the pixels selected as relevant for the enhancement, e.g. (Jobson et al., 1997), (M. Lecca, A. Rizzi, and R.P. Serapioni, 2017), (Lecca, 2018), (Lecca and Messelodi, 2019). For all the Retinex inspired methods, the definition of the locality, i.e. of the neighborhood of $x$ to be processed or of the distance function, is a key point. For instance, when the all the pixels around $x$ are considered, these algorithms tends to behave like the Max-RGB algorithm. This latter rescales the intensity of each pixel by the maximum intensity over the image, but this leads to unsatisfactory results on most real world and noisy images. When the neighborhood of $x$ is very small, the final
image is close to an edge map, where chromatic information and some details are lost. A priori knowledge about image content and/or light sources may greatly help to choose the neighborhood or distance function maximizing the algorithm performance, but such a knowledge is often unavailable.

Retinex algorithms at multiple resolution allow to simulate the effects of HDR imaging (Jobson et al., 1997), (Petro et al., 2014): the input image is processed sequentially by a Retinex algorithm with increasing neighborhood (or support for the distance function) and the obtained images are averaged together. This approach avoids the user to select a specific extent of the pixel neighborhood while stretches the dynamic range of the image, brightening the dark regions. Nevertheless, the prize to pay is a longer computational time, a less accurate removal of the light effects and sometimes the generation of artifacts.

Other algorithms, e.g. (Tsai and Yeh, 2010), (Li and Wu, 2018), (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012), specifically address the problem of enhancing backlight/spotlight images. To this purpose, they segment the input image in backlight/frontlight regions and re-work them with different enhancing functions. In particular, the work in (Tsai and Yeh, 2010) segments the image by thresholding, then linearly stretches and shifts separately the dark and bright regions in order to brighten the first one and darken the second one. A variant of this computational scheme is proposed by (Li and Wu, 2018) (hereafter denoted as Backlit), that replaces the thresholding based segmentation with a region growing approach and introduces guided filters for improving the results. Specifically, the image is partitioned in backlight and frontlight regions through support vector machines and conditional random fields, and each segmented region is enhanced by a tone mapping function which maximizes the Weber contrast while minimizing tone distortions. Region borders are processed by a linear combination of the tone mapping functions estimated before to avoid artifacts. For all these approaches, the use of different functions for enhancing the dark and bright regions enables good results, which however strongly depend on the segmentation accuracy. The work in (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012), here called Channel division, enhances edges and flat regions with different approaches considering image texture. The enhancement results obtained on edges and flat regions are blended together to highlight details while maintaining the smoothness of flat regions. This method provides good results for a wide range of images, but it poorly works in extreme conditions, as for instance on pictures with near-black portions, where the contrast computation is affected by noise. The work in (Wang et al., 2016), here shortly named Fusion, proposes a fusion method, that processes the input image \( I \) in the HVS space and computes from it an image \( I_1 \) with over-enhanced dark regions, an image \( I_2 \) where the dynamic range of bright regions has been compressed, and image \( I_3 \) with enhanced contrast. Each image \( I_i \) is smoothed by a Laplacian operator to remove undesired halos, then it is pixel-wise multiplied to a weight that controls its overall exposure. The resulting images are averaged and the result is the enhanced version of \( I \).

The difficulty in defining the spatial locality of the image processing, the generation of artifacts along the edges, the low quality of the image signal in dark regions, the lack of a priori knowledge about the image content are issues that make hard and challenging the enhancement of a bad illuminated image and this justifies the research of new methods.

3 THE PROPOSED APPROACH

This Section presents SuPeR (3.1) and its variant SuPeR-B (Subsection 3.2).

3.1 SuPeR

Among the many Retinex implementations and in particular among the algorithms of the Milano Retinex family (Rizzi and Bonanomi, 2017), the Retinex inspired spatial color algorithm SuPeR is of interest not only for its enhancement performance, but also for its fast computational times, requiring less than 0.2 seconds to process an image with size \( 640 \times 480 \) with 100 tiles on a standard PC with CPU Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E3-1245 v6 at 3.70 GHz (see (Lecca et al., 2019)).

SuPeR takes as input a color image \( T \) and an integer parameter \( n > 0 \). It enhances \( T \) by implementing some principles which are at the basis of the Retinex theory, i.e. 1) independent processing of the three image channels; 2) channel processing based on local spatial and intensity information; 3) image enhancement with smoothing/removal of light effects.

Let us introduce some notation. Let \( I \) be a channel of \( T \) and let \( S \) be the domain of \( T \), i.e. the set of the spatial coordinates of the pixels composing \( T \) (and thus \( I \)). Let \( D \) denote the length of the diagonal of \( S \). Here, the channel \( I \) is regarded as a function from \( S \) to the intensity range \( (0, 1] \), where zero has been excluded to enable the computation of intensity ratios. Let \( L \) indicate the enhanced version of \( I \). SuPeR enhances \( T \) by implementing sequentially a global and a pixel-wise image processing.
In the global processing, SuPeR partitions $S$ in $n$ rectangular, not overlapping tiles $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ by a regular grid superimposed on $S$. According to the principle 1 reported above, SuPeR processes each channel independently. Specifically, given the channel $I$, SuPeR computes the set $B = \{(b_i, m_i) : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$, where $b_i \in S$ is the barycenter of $T_i$ and $m_i$ is the maximum channel intensity over $T_i$.

In the pixel-wise processing, SuPeR maps the intensity $I(x)$ of any $x \in S$ on a new value $L(x)$ defined as follows:

$$L(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{(b_i,m_i) \in B} (1 - d(x,b_i)) I(x)}{\sum_{(b_i,m_i) \in B} (1 - d(x,b_i))} & \text{if } B \neq \emptyset \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $B = \{(b,m) \in B : I(x) < m\}$ and $d$ is the Euclidean distance between $x$ and $b$, normalized to range between 0 and 1:

$$d(x,b) = \frac{\|x - b\|^2}{D^2}. \tag{2}$$

According to Equation (1), given the point $x$, SuPeR selects from $B$ the subset $B_x$ composed by the pairs $(b,m)$ corresponding to tiles whose maximum intensity exceeds $I(x)$. If $B_x$ is empty, then the intensity $I(x)$ is mapped onto one, otherwise it is rescaled by the values $m$s and each ratio $I(x)/m$ is averaged with a weight $d$ depending on the distance of $b$ from $x$. This weight models the spatial locality of the algorithm and decreases by increasing the distance of $b$ from $x$. This behaviour is in line with the Retinex principle stating that the intensities close to $x$ influence the perception of $I(x)$ more than those located further (principle 2).

The final enhanced image is obtained by packing the $L$’s into an RGB image, which is robust to changes of light (principle 3). In fact, the division of $I(x)$ by other intensity values enables smoothing or even discounting light effects, such as shadows or color dominants of the illumination. This is in line with the von Kries model (Finlayson et al., 1994), (Lecca, 2014), stating that the change of any pixel RGB triplet caused by a light variation can be approximated by a linear diagonal transform of the RGB triplet. In the original paper of SuPeR, the authors suggest to smooth the input image by a median filter so that to make the method robust to salt and pepper noise.

The experiments on SuPeR, conducted on real-world images, showed good performance, both in terms of enhancement and of computational time. The images were improved by increasing their brightness and their contrasts and by flattening their color distribution. Some examples are shown in Fig. 2. Nevertheless, in case of images with extreme conditions, such as backlight and spotlight, the performance of SuPeR decreases, as illustrated in Fig. 3 and discussed in the next Subsection.

### 3.2 SuPeR-B

Figure 3 shows an example of image with extreme backlight, depicting a giraffe against a brilliant, redish sky. The enhancement by SuPeR smooths the effects of the light changing the colors of the sky, but the giraffe appears still dark and its details are undetectable. Regarding the results of the other algorithms specifically designed to cope with backlight, the algorithm Channel Division (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012) performs poorly, while the others (i.e. the multi-scale Retinex MSR described in (Petro et al., 2014), Fusion (Wang et al., 2016) and Backlit (Li and Wu, 2018)) work a little better, but the visibility of the giraffe remains low.

The bad result by SuPeR is due to the fact that the intensity values of the pixels inside the dark regions are divided by much greater intensity values sampled from the sky. Although penalized by the distance function, these sky intensities contribute heavily to the image enhancement and make the values of $L$ decreasing on the giraffe region. As already mentioned in Section 3, multi-resolution Retinex inspired algorithms, as MSR, tend to generate artifacts and they do not ensure a good removal/smoothing of the light effects. This discourages the application of SuPeR at multiple scales. Thresholding the distance function in Equation (1) to exclude the high sky intensities from the enhancement of the dark region may appear a possible way to increase the giraffe intensities, but it may cause the loss of important edges, as those on the borders. A novel solution is proposed by SuPeR-B.
SuPeR-B inherits from SuPeR the general workflow, i.e., it processes the image channels separately by the two global and local routines of SuPeR, but introduces in Equation (1) a novel function \( f \) that weights the contribution of the intensities in \( B \), not only upon their spatial distance from \( x \) but also upon their difference from \( I(x) \). Specifically, SuPeR-B replaces the equation (1) with the following one:

\[
L_B(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\sum_{(b,m) \in B} f(\delta I(x,b), d(x,b)) I(b) I(x)}{\sum_{(b,m) \in B} f(\delta I(x,b), d(x,b))} & \text{if } B \neq \emptyset \\
1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(3)

where \( \delta I(x,b) = I(b) - I(x) \) and \( f \) weights the intensities close to \( x \) and to \( I(x) \) more than the other values. While on bright regions the values of \( f \) is almost irrelevant, on dark regions they are set to increase the brightness and the detail visibility.

There exist many expressions for \( f \) and different expressions produce different enhancement levels. In the current implementation of SuPeR-B, \( f \) is modeled by a Coon patch, i.e., a compact surface in 3D space whose borders are described by paths in 2D space intersecting two by two at the four patch corners (see Figure 4 for an example). Precisely, let \( c_0, d_0, c_1, d_1 : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R} \) be four continuous paths with \( c_0(0) = d_0(0), c_0(1) = d_1(0), c_1(0) = d_0(1) \) and \( c_1(1) = d_1(1) \). The equation of the Coon patch bounded by these paths is:

\[
C(s, t) = S(s, t) + T(s, t) - U(s, t) 
\]  

(4)

where

\[
S(s, t) = (1 - t)c_0(s) + tc_1(s) \\
T(s, t) = (1 - s)d_0(t) + sd_1(t) \\
U(s, t) = c_0(0)(1 - s)(1 - t) + c_0(1)s(1 - t) + c_1(0)(1 - s)t + c_1(1)st.
\]

Pictorially, we can imagine that the endpoints of the path \( c_0 \), which belongs to the xz plane, move respectively along the paths \( d_0 \) and \( d_1 \) modifying the shape of \( c_0 \) accordingly until \( c_0 \) rests (and coincides) with \( c_1 \). The same representation holds for \( d_0 \), whose end-
points are initially over \( c_0(0) \) and \( c_1(0) \) and go respectively to \( d_1(0) \) and \( d_1(1) \) until \( d_0 \) reaches (and coincide with) \( d_1 \). Moving the corners and/or changing the path equations allows to model a lot of surfaces.

\[
\begin{align*}
c_0(s) &= s(\alpha - 1) + 1 \\
c_1(s) &= s(b - a) + a \\
d_0(t) &= t(a - 1) + 1 \\
d_1(t) &= t(b - \alpha) + \alpha
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \alpha, b, a \) are real-world user parameters and \( s, t \in [0, 1] \). In order to ensure positivity of the weights, the function \( f \) is defined as

\[
f(s,t) = \max(C(s,t),0),
\]

where the parameters \( s \) and \( t \) represent respectively the variation of intensity \( \delta I \) and the value of \( d \) between two image pixels.

The values of \( \alpha, a, b \) must be chosen so that (i) to satisfy the Retinex principle stating that the contribution of the sampled pixels to the enhancement decreases with their distance from \( x \), and (ii) to improve the visibility of the image content in the dark regions by weighting more the items of \( B_x \) closest to \( I(x) \) in the intensity space. As a general condition, for \( \alpha, a, b \) such that

\[
\alpha \leq 1, a < 1, b \leq \min\{a, \alpha\}
\]

the requirements (i) and (ii) are satisfied. In fact, when \( a \geq 1 \), the intensities spatially located far from \( x \) become more relevant than those close to \( x \) in the computation of \( L(x) \) and this violates the requirement (i). On the contrary, values of \( a < 1 \) enables the implementation of (i). The parameter \( \alpha \) acts in the intensity domain similarly to \( d \) in the spatial domain: \( \alpha \) controls the contribution of \( \delta I \) to \( L(x) \), making the intensities of \( B(x) \) closer to \( I(x) \) in the intensity domain more important than the others. The value \( \alpha = 1 \) is in this case admitted and used to weight equally the intensity variations at a given distance, regardless of their amount, since \( c_0(\delta I(x,b)) = 1 \) for any value of \( \delta I(x,b) \). When \( \alpha < 1 \), the relevance of \( \delta I(x,b) \) decreases proportionally to the value \( \delta I(x,b) \). The parameter \( b \) controls the value of \( f \) as \( d \) and \( \delta I \) grow away: the lower \( b \), the lower the effects of high values of \( d \) and \( \delta I \) are on \( L(x) \). Values of \( b \) greater than \( a \) and \( \alpha \) make \( f \) increasing when \( d \) and \( \delta I \) grow and this trend has to be prevented because in contrast with both the requirements (i) and (ii). Therefore, \( b \) must be smaller than \( \min\{a, \alpha\}\).

Finally, we note that for some choices of \( \alpha, a, b \), the values of \( C \) may become smaller than zero; these values must be excluded from the computation of \( f \), therefore \( C \) is cast to zero as described by Equation (1). This operation extends the range of variability of the parameters \( \alpha, a, b \) defined by the inequalities (6), cutting down values of \( f \) for which the requirements (i) and (ii) are not fulfilled.

Examples of \( f \) obtained for different values of \( \alpha, a, b \) are shown in Fig. 3 along with the corresponding enhancement by SuPeR-B. For all the parameter values used here, the yellowish color due to the light has been removed. In particular, for \( \alpha = 0, -1 \), the input image has been remarkably improved. A more deep analysis of the enhancement results of SuPeR-B is provided in the next Section.

### 3.3 Experiments

The performance of SuPeR-B has been measured on a database of 60 images with dark and bright regions at different proportions. These images have been taken from Pixabay (https://pixabay.com/), from private collections of the author and from databases published on the net and used to test and illustrate enhancement methods, e.g. (Wang et al., 2016), (Fu et al., 2016), (Li and Wu, 2018), (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012). Some examples of such images are shown in Figures 3 and 4.

The results of SuPeR-B have been compared with the four enhancers briefly described in Section 2, i.e. Channel Division (Ramirez Rivera et al., 2012), Fusion (Wang et al., 2016), Backlit (Li and Wu, 2018) along with an implementation of the multiscale Retinex implementation (Petro et al., 2014).

The evaluation has been carried out by comparing three objective measures of image quality before and after applying the enhancement procedures. These measures, that are widely used to judge the perfor-

---
1 Code: http://vision.khu.ac.kr/?page_id=551
2 Code: https://xueyangfu.github.io/
3 Code: https://github.com/7thChord/backlit
4 Code: https://it.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/71386-multiscale-retinex
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Figure 5: Comparison of enhancement results on a (a) backlight, (b) spotlight, (c) dark image.

Performance of an enhancer, are computed on the brightness $Br$ of any color image $\mathbf{T}$. $Br$ is the gray-level image defined on $S$ and obtained by averaging pixel-wise the channel intensities of $\mathbf{T}$, i.e.:

$$Br(x) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=0}^{3} I_i(x) \quad \forall x \in S,$$

where the $I_i$s denote the color channels of $\mathbf{T}$.

The evaluation measures are defined as follows:

1. Flatness of the luminance probability density ($f_0$), i.e. the $L^1$ distance between the probability density function of $Br$ and the uniform probability density function. The lower $f_0$, the lower the entropy of $Br$ is. An image enhancer is expected to decrease the value of $f_0$ measured on the input image. In fact, this means that in the enhanced image the dynamic range of the colors is wider than in the input image, meaning that strong changes of light and brightness have been smoothed or even removed;

2. Mean value of the brightness ($f_1$), i.e. the average of the intensities of $Br$. Enhancement usually
increases the value of $f_1$, since it makes the input image brighter.

3. Mean value of the multi-resolution luminance contrast ($f_2$), i.e. a measure of the local variations of the $Br$ values at multiple scales proposed in (Rizzi et al., 2004). $f_2$ is computed as follows. The image $Br$ is sequentially half-scaled. For each rescaled version $Br_{r_i}$ of $Br$, a pixel wise contrast $cBr_{r_i}(x)$ and a global contrast $cBr$ are computed. Precisely, $cBr_{r_i}(x)$ is the average value of the absolute differences between the luminance $Br(x)$ at $x \in S$ and its 8-neighboring values, while $cBr$ is the mean value of the $cBr_{r_i}(x)$'s. The measure $f_2$ is defined as the mean value of the $cBr$'s over the number of scale factors. Any enhancer is expected to improve the visibility of the details, and thus to increase the value of $f_2$ with respect to that of the input image.

It is to note that the exact amount of the $f_0$, $f_1$ and $f_2$ depend on the image content. Images with already clear (unreadable, resp.) content have usually a low (high, resp.) value of $f_0$ and high (low, resp.) values of $f_1$ and $f_2$. What is important to evaluate an enhancer is the variation of the $f_i$s after the enhancement: the less readable the image, the more relevant this variation is. Therefore, in this work the evaluation of the performances of the enhancers has been conducted by comparing the values of the $f_i$s on the input and on the enhanced images. In addition, in order to provide more detailed information about the enhancement of the dark and bright regions, each input image has been segmented in two parts $P_B$ and $P_D$. The $f_i$s are thus computed on $P_D$ and $P_B$ instead of the whole image and indicated respectively with $f^D_i$ and $f^B_i$. The segmentation has been performed by a thresholding procedure such that:

$$P_B = \{x \in S : Br(x) > \tau\}$$

$$P_D = \{x \in S : Br(x) \leq \tau\}$$

and $\tau = (\max_{x \in S} Br(x) - \min_{x \in S} Br(x))/2$. Basically, this segmentation partitions the input image in two regions with different luminance, with $P_D$ darker than $P_B$. Despite naive, this segmentation allows to separate the frontlight and backlight regions of the input images in a sufficiently reliable way.

The current implementation of SuPeR-B is written in C++. The parameter $n$ has been set to 100. The experiments have been repeated for different triplets of $(a, b, \alpha)$ obtained by varying $a, b$ in $[-1, 0]$ and $\alpha$ in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ within the inequalities in formula (6). For $\alpha = 1$ and $a = b = 0$, SuPeR-B behaves like SuPeR. The function $f_0$ is computed in the global processing phase, is discretized and represented as a matrix with size $100 \times 100$ to speed up the computational time for the enhancement, that is on average less than 1 second (on a notebook with Intel CORE i5 and operating system Windows 10). In these experiments, no median filter has been applied.

Table 1 reports the mean values of the performance evaluation measures computed on the whole image ($f_i$s), on the bright region $P_B$ ($f_i^B$s) and on the dark region ($f_i^D$s). Precisely, these values have been averaged over the number of dataset images.

All the enhancers improve the image content, by increasing the values of $f_1$ and $f_2$, while decreasing that of $f_0$. MSR achieves the best results in term of $f_0$ and $f_2$, but as already observed in the paper MSR suffers for halos generation (see Fig. 5(a) for an example). Channel Division outputs the worst results in terms of $f_0$ and $f_1$, returning an image still dark and with a remarkable difference between dark and bright regions, as proved by the gap between $f_0^B$ and $f_0^D$ (see for instance, Fig. 5(b) and (c)). In particular, Channel Division yields the highest value of $f_0^B$ and the lowest value of $f_0^D$. For $\alpha = -1$, SuPeR-B outputs the highest values of $f_1$ and very low values of $f_0$, while in general, for any choice of the parameters $\alpha, a, b$, it obtains values of $f_2$ close to those of Channel Division, SuPeR, Fusion and Backlit.

A similar trend is observed for the dark regions $P_D$. Again, the readability of the $P_D$s is improved by all the enhancers, MSR grants the lowest $f_0^D$ and the highest $f_2^D$. Channel Division reports the lowest $f_0$ and SuPeR-B performs similar to SuPeR, Fusion, Backlit and Channel Division in terms of contrast while reports for $\alpha = -1$ very high values of $f_1^D$ and very low values of $f_0^D$.

The results on the $P_D$s could appear quite surprising: in fact, here, apart from Channel Division, all the enhancers increase the brightness, but decrease the contrast, while the histogram flatness remains high and in many cases exceeds that measured on the input images. This behaviour is justified as follows. On the bright regions, enhancement is usually not necessary since the content is already clear. Anyway, the brightness of the $P_D$s, that is on average very high on the input, is further increased by the enhancers, although much less than that of the $P_B$s. The point is that in the enhanced images, the brightness is very close to its maximum value (i.e. 255) and consequently its histogram is peaked on right and thus far from an uniform probability density function (i.e. $f_0^D$ is high). Moreover, in the dataset considered here, the bright regions are often almost uniform or present few or slight edges. The main contribution to the contrast of the $P_D$s comes from their boundaries with the dark regions $f_0^D$s. Despite the enhancers preserve these boundaries, they diminish their magnitude be-
Table 1: Evaluation of SuPeR-B in comparison with other enhancers. For SuPeR-B the triplet \((\alpha, a, b)\) is reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>(f_0) ([\times 10^{-3}])</th>
<th>(f_1)</th>
<th>(f_2)</th>
<th>(f_0^1)</th>
<th>(f_1^1)</th>
<th>(f_2^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>179.33</td>
<td>33.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>118.12</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>185.23</td>
<td>30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANNEL DIVISION</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>89.45</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>228.30</td>
<td>36.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUSION</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>89.54</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>189.51</td>
<td>32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKLIT</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>100.65</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>189.30</td>
<td>28.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>104.95</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>210.54</td>
<td>29.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>106.64</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>210.78</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (1, 0, -1)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>105.32</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>210.51</td>
<td>30.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>119.31</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>213.03</td>
<td>26.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (0, 0, -1)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>123.13</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>213.47</td>
<td>25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (0, -1, -1)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>123.48</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>213.43</td>
<td>26.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (-1, 0, -1)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>141.15</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>218.85</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPeR-B (-1, -1, -1)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>142.35</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>219.29</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cause they increase the brightness of \(P_B\); this causes the decrease of \(f_1^2\). Channel Division represents an exception, since the trend of the \(f_1^0\)'s is the same as those of the \(f_2^0\) and of the \(f_3\)'s. Nevertheless, as already mentioned above, among the enhancers, this algorithm achieves unsatisfactory results, with still dark images characterized by high gap between \(f_2^0\) and \(f_1^0\). Regarding SuPeR-B, it is to note that the values of \(f_2^0\) it reports are in general smaller than those of the other enhancers. This is because, in line with Retinex theory and as well as SuPeR, SuPeR-B tends to remove slight edges, that are often present in the bright regions but that are considered to be irrelevant for understanding the main content of the scene. In particular, the low values of \(f_2^0\) indicate a scarce presence of edges on \(P_B\), and this justifies the high values of \(f_0^0\).

Figure 3 shows that different values of \(\alpha, a, b\) provide very different enhancement results. In accordance with Equation (3), the parameters \(\alpha\) and \(a\) tune respectively the contributions to \(L_B(x)\) of the intensity differences and of the spatial differences, while the parameter \(b\) controls both these contributions when the intensity and spatial differences are large. In particular, lowering \(\alpha\) increases the weight of the small intensity differences and this generally higher the values of \(f_1\) and \(f_2\), especially in dark areas. For any fixed value of \(\alpha\), low values of \(a\) increase the spatial locality of the algorithm, yielding again high values of \(f_1\) and \(f_2\). Low values of \(b\) further decreases the weight of high intensity and spatial differences. Therefore, the lower \(\alpha, a, b\), the higher the locality of the algorithm in spatial and intensity domains is.

According to such observations, when \(\alpha = 1\), SuPeR-B behaves similarly to SuPeR: in fact, in this case the contribution to \(L_B(x)\) of the intensity variations does not depend on their amount and the Coon patch is close to a stepway, whose slope is determined by the spatial terms. As already mentioned before, for \(\alpha = 1, a = b = 0\), SuPeR-B implements SuPeR, where the locality of the image processing depends exclusively on the spatial features. Figure 3(a) show an example of image enhancement obtained by tuning only the contribution of the spatial differences with \(\alpha = 1, a = b = -20\): the details of the giraffe become a little more visible, but the giraffe is still quite dark and its borders are very tick, so that the results is unsatisfactory. Better results are obtained by tuning the algorithm locality also in the intensity domain, as shown by the enhanced pictures of Figure 3(a) obtained for \(\alpha = -1, -2\).

In general, the experiments show that for backlight and spotlight images the best performance is achieved by tuning the differences in both the spatial and intensity domains.

Finally, differently from the algorithms considered here except for SuPeR, SuPeR-B exhibits the important property of lowering the color cast due to the illumination, returning an enhanced image robust to
changes of light. This property is clearly illustrated in Figure 5(c) and it is of great importance for many machine vision algorithms, such as illumination invariant feature matching and people/object recognition in real-world scenarios.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The Retinex inspired spatial color algorithm SuPer-B proposes a novel and efficacious technique to enhance images captured under difficult light, in particular under backlight and local, not diffused spotlights that hamper understanding the image content. SuPer-B basically implements a bilateral processing of the channel intensities of the image pixels that enable brightening dark regions, smoothing color casts due to the light, while preserving important edges. The bilateral processing is modeled by the weighting function $f$, that here has been expressed as a Coon surface bounded by lines. The experiments proved that this choice of $f$ provides a satisfactory level of enhancement, also in comparison with other algorithms at the state-of-the-art. The input images are remarkably improved by SuPer-B, which increase their brightness and detail visibility, especially in the dark areas, while decrease the overall color distribution entropy.

As mentioned in Section 3, there are many expressions for $f$: determining the equation of $f$ and the values of its parameters most suitable for enhancing an image within a given task is a critical point for a reliable and aware usage of SuPer. In general, in the current implementation of SuPer-B, the choice of the values of $\alpha, a, b$ to be input to SuPer-B should be guided by the applications at the hand as well as by the image content. For instance, for human inspection of the content of the giraffe image in Figure 3, the values $(\alpha, a, b) = (0, 0, 0)$ and $(1, 0, -1)$ perform poorly in comparison with the others. In other cases, like for $(\alpha, a, b) = (-1, -1, -1)$, the brightness of the enhanced image is too high and the image content is washed out or over-enhanced. As a conclusion, the set-up of $f$ is an open issue to be investigated in the future.

Future work will also include the usage of SuPer-B within computer vision tasks that require to process high quality images, as for instance image description and matching. In this respect, as pointed out in (Lecca et al., 2019) and as illustrated by the examples in Figure 6, the improvement of visual characteristics such as brightness, contrast and color distribution does not only grant a better visibility and readability of the image content for humans, but it is also fundamental to improve the detection of image key-points (here performed by SIFT (Lowe, 2004)) and thus to increase the performance of algorithms for description and matching of images regardless of their illumination conditions.
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