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Abstract

In this paper we describe the implementation of state-of-the-art video denoising algorithm SPTWO [A. Buades, J.L. Lisani, M. Miladinović, Patch Based Video Denoising with Optical Flow Estimation, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 25 (6), 2573–2586]. This algorithm, inspired by image fusion techniques, uses motion compensation by regularized optical flow methods, which permits robust patch comparison in spatiotemporal volumes. Groups of similar patches are denoised using Principal Component Analysis, which ensures the correct preservation of fine texture and details.

Source Code

The reviewed source code and documentation for this algorithm are available from the web page of this article.
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1 Introduction

Most video denoising methods assume the white Gaussian noise model. Let us denote the image sequence by \( I(x, y, t) \), with \((x, y)\) the spatial coordinates and \(t\) the temporal component, then this model assumes that

\[
I(x, y, t) = I_0(x, y, t) + n(x, y, t),
\]

where \(I_0\) is the true image sequence and \(n(x, y, t)\) the noise i.i.d. realizations of a Gaussian variable of zero mean and standard deviation \(\sigma\).

Early methods for video denoising simply extended the techniques developed for single images to a sequence of frames. Besides the obvious use of these techniques on a frame by frame basis, local average methods, such as the bilateral filter [19], or patch based methods such as NL-means [4] or BM3D [7] and NLBayes [12] can be easily adapted to video just by extending the neighboring area to the adjacent frames. Kervrann and Boulanger [3] extended NL-means to video by growing
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adaptively the spatio-temporal neighborhood. Arias et al. extended NL-Bayes [12] to video [1, 2]. The BM3D extension, VBM4D [14], exploits the mutual similarity between 3-D spatio-temporal volumes constructed by tracking blocks along trajectories defined by the motion vectors. Methods based on sparse decompositions are extended to image sequences [15, 17, 20, 13], as well as approaches based on low rank approximation [9, 10].

The performance of local average methods is improved by introducing motion compensation. These compensated filters estimate explicitly the motion of the sequence and compensate the neighborhoods yielding stationary data [16]. In [5] the authors proposed to combine optical flow estimation and patch based methods for denoising. Their algorithm tends to a fusion of the neighboring frames in the absence of occlusions and a dense temporal sampling. In this ideal scenario, an optical flow or global registration is able to align the frames and fusion is achieved by simple averaging [8]. The algorithm in [5] compensates the failure of these requirements by introducing spatiotemporal patch comparison and denoising in an adapted PCA based transform.

In this paper we describe (Section 2) the method in [5] (the so-called SPTWO algorithm), we discuss its parameters (Section 3) and computational complexity (Section 4) and we illustrate its performance showing some experimental results (Section 5). Finally, some conclusions are exposed in Section 6.

2 Complete Algorithm Description

The proposed algorithm is applied in two steps (see Algorithm 1). The denoised sequence from the first step is used in the second step to improve the final denoising result. Algorithm 2 describes the denoising method, which is applied in a frame by frame basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm 1: SPTWO Denoising Algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frames alignment. Given a frame \( I_k \) from a sequence \( \{I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_N\} \), a set of \( M \) neighboring frames is first extracted and aligned with respect to \( I_k \) (Algorithm 3). This alignment implies the computation of the optical flow between each of the neighboring frames and \( I_k \), and the application of the computed flow to warp each frame into the same spatial domain than \( I_k \). The warping procedure is implemented using bicubic interpolation. Ideally, at the end of the process, all the values in the warped sequence associated to a given pixel \( x \), should correspond to the same spatial location in the scene. If registration was accurate and the sequence free of occlusions, a temporal average in this aligned data would be optimal. However, the noise standard deviation would slowly decrease as \( 1/\sqrt{M} \), where \( M \) is the number of aligned frames. Generally, this will not be the case, inaccuracies and errors in the computed flow and the presence of occlusions make this temporal average likely to blur the sequence and have artifacts near occlusions. The proposed approach tends to solve these limitations.

\(^2\)We use the method and code described in [18] to compute the optical flow.
Algorithm 2: SPTWO single step

Input : noisy video sequence $I = I_1, \ldots, I_N$, oracle video sequence $O = O_1, \ldots, O_N$ (optional), noise standard deviation $\sigma$

Output : denoised sequence $\tilde{I} = \tilde{I}_1, \ldots, \tilde{I}_N$.

1 for $k = 1, \ldots, N$ do
   //Get aligned sequence and detect occluded pixels in temporal neighborhood
   if $O$ then
      $[I^W, O^W, M] = \text{Align\_Frames}(I, O, k, \sigma) //\text{Algorithm 3}$
   else
      $[I^W, M] = \text{Align\_Frames}(I, k, \sigma) //\text{Algorithm 3}$
   //Denoise frame $k$
   $\tilde{I}_k = 0 //\text{Initialize denoised frame}$
   Counter $= 0 //\text{Initialize counter: for each pixel, count in how many}$
   denoised patches it is contained
   Label all the pixels in the domain of $I_k$ as “not processed”
   for each pixel $x$ in the domain of $I_k$ labeled as “not processed” do
      if $O$ then
         $(S, S^O) = \text{Get\_Similar\_Patches}(I^W, O^W, M, x, k) //\text{Algorithm 5}$
         $\tilde{S} = \text{Patches\_Denoising}(S, S^O, \sigma) //\text{Denoised patches, Algorithm 7}$
      else
         $S = \text{Get\_Similar\_Patches}(I^W, M, x, k) //\text{Algorithm 5}$
         $\tilde{S} = \text{Patches\_Denoising}(S, \sigma) //\text{Denoised patches, Algorithm 7}$
      //Aggregation
      for each denoised patch $\tilde{P}$ in $\tilde{S}$ extracted from frame $k$ do
         Label as “processed” the center of the patch
         for each pixel $y$ in $\tilde{P}$ do
            $\tilde{I}_k(y) = \tilde{I}_k(y) + \tilde{P}(y) //\text{Accumulate denoised value at } y$
            Counter($y$) = Counter($y$) + 1 //Increase counter
      for each pixel $x$ in the domain of $I_k$ do
         $\tilde{I}_k(x) = \tilde{I}_k(x)/\text{Counter}(x) //\text{Normalize accumulated values}$

Occlusions management. In order to take into account the presence of occlusions and flow inaccuracies, an occlusion mask $M$ is computed that indicates in which pixels of the spatial domain the ideal situation holds (Algorithm 4). Occlusions are detected depending on the divergence of the computed flow: negative divergence values indicate occlusions. Additionally, the color difference is checked after flow compensation. A large difference indicates occlusion, or at least failure of the color constancy assumption. We combine both criteria for a pixel $x = (x, y)$ and the computed flow between $I_0$ and $I_1$, into the weighting function

$$w(x) = e^{-\frac{|I_0(x) - I_1(x + u(x))|^2}{\sigma_i^2}} \cdot e^{-\frac{\min(\text{div}(u), 0)^2}{\sigma_d^2}},$$

where $\sigma_d$ is fixed while $\sigma_i$ depends on the noise standard deviation ($\sigma_i = f_o \sigma$, where $f_o$ is a tuning parameter). This weight function is binarized by thresholding at 0.5, giving a mask of occluded pixels (a ‘0’ value meaning “occluded”, and ‘1’ “non-occluded”). These occluded pixels having a
Algorithm 3: Align_Frames

Input : video sequence \( I = I_1, \ldots, I_N \), oracle video sequence (optional)
\( \mathcal{O} = O_1, \ldots, O_N \), index of reference frame \( k \), noise standard deviation \( \sigma \)

Parameters: radius of temporal neighborhood \( t \) (\( M = 2t + 1 \) frames in neighborhood)

Output : set of aligned frames \( I^W \), set of aligned oracle frames (if \( \mathcal{O} \) provided) \( \mathcal{O}^W \), occlusion masks \( \mathcal{M} \).

1. \( I^W = \emptyset \), \( \mathcal{M} = \emptyset \)
2. if \( \mathcal{O} \) then \( \mathcal{O}^W = \emptyset \) \( N_k^j = \{ j \in 1, \ldots, N / |j - k| \leq t \} \) //Temporal neighborhood of frame \( k \)
3. for \( j \in N_k^j \) do
4. if \( j \neq k \) then
5. if \( \mathcal{O} \) then
6. \( u_{kj} = \text{Optical Flow}(O_k, O_j) \) //Optical flow from \( O_k \) to \( O_j \): \( O_k(x) \simeq O_j(x + u_{kj}(x)) \)
7. else
8. \( u_{kj} = \text{Optical Flow}(I_k, I_j) \) //Optical flow from \( I_k \) to \( I_j \): \( I_k(x) \simeq I_j(x + u_{kj}(x)) \)
9. else
10. \( u_{kk} = 0 \)
//Warp (align) frame \( I_j \) using the computed flow
11. for each pixel \( x \) in the domain of \( I_j \) do
12. \( I^W_j(x) = I_j(x + u_{kj}(x)) \)
13. if \( \mathcal{O} \) then
14. for each pixel \( x \) in the domain of \( I_j \) do
15. \( O^W_j(x) = O_j(x + u_{kj}(x)) \)
//Build occlusion mask (Algorithm 4)
16. if \( \mathcal{O} \) then
17. \( M_j = \text{Occlusion Mask}(I_k, I_j, O_k, O_j, u_{kj}, \sigma) \)
18. else
19. \( M_j = \text{Occlusion Mask}(I_k, I_j, u_{kj}, \sigma) \)
20. \( \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M} \cup M_j \)
21. \( I^W = I^W \cup I^W_j \)
22. if \( \mathcal{O} \) then \( \mathcal{O}^W = \mathcal{O}^W \cup O^W_j \)

Negative divergence of the flow and a large color difference after flow compensation are located near the discontinuities of the motion field. The left-right coherence of the computed flow is also checked: ideally, for a given pixel, the flow from frame \( k \) to frame \( j \) should have the same magnitude and opposite direction than the flow from frame \( j \) to frame \( k \). Points that fail to satisfy, up to a tolerance factor, this condition are labeled as “occluded” in the occlusion mask.

Selection of similar patches. Once all the frames in the temporal neighborhood have been aligned, a set of patches is associated to each pixel \( x \) in the reference image (Algorithms 5 and 6). Let \( \{ I^W_{k-t}, \ldots, I^W_{k+t} \} \) be the set of adjacent frames to \( I_k \) after warping with the computed optical flow, and let \( M_j \) be the occlusion mask between frames \( I_k \) and \( I^W_j \), \( j \in \{k - t, \ldots, k + t\} \). For each \( n \times n \) patch \( P \) of the reference frame \( I_k \), we consider the patch (3D block) \( b^{3D} \) referring to its extension to the temporal dimension, having \( M \) times more pixels than the original one (assuming \( M \) patches
Algorithm 4: Occlusion_Mask

**Input**: source image $I_0$, target image $I_1$, oracle source image (optional) $O_0$, oracle target image (optional) $O_1$, optical flow from $I_0$ to $I_1$ (or from $O_0$ to $O_1$, if provided); $\bm{u}$, noise standard deviation $\sigma$

**Parameters**: factor for gray level values $f_o(\sigma_i = f_o \sigma)$, factor for divergence values $\sigma_d$, binary mask threshold $\tau_{\text{bin}}$, left-right coherence threshold $\tau_{\text{dist}}$

**Output**: binary labels for all the pixels of the image domain: “occluded”, “not occluded”

//Check for color differences and negative divergence values (Equation (1))

for each pixel $x$ in the domain of $I_k$ do

1. $w(x) = e^{-|I_0(x) - I_1(x + \lfloor u(x) \rfloor)|^2 \sigma_i^2} \cdot e^{-\min(\text{div}_u, 0)^2 \sigma_d^2}$

//Check for left-right coherence of the flow

3. if $O_0$ AND $O_1$ then
4. $u' = \text{Optical\_Flow}(O_1, O_0)$ //Optical flow from $O_1$ to $O_0$
5. else
6. $u' = \text{Optical\_Flow}(I_1, I_0)$ //Optical flow from $I_1$ to $I_0$

7. for each pixel $x$ in the domain of $I_k$ do
8. $v(x) = u(x) + u'(x + \lfloor u(x) \rfloor)$ // $\lfloor u \rfloor$ denotes the floor operator applied on each component of $u$

//Ideally $v = (v_x, v_y) = (0, 0)$. If $(w(x) < \tau_{\text{bin}})$ OR $(\max\{|v_x|, |v_y|\} > \tau_{\text{dist}})$ then
9. Output label $(x)$ = “occluded”
else
10. Output label $(x)$ = “not occluded”

in the temporal neighborhood\(^3\), $M = 2t + 1$), $b^{3D} = \{P_{k-t}, \ldots, P_{k+t}\}$. The algorithm looks for the extended patches (3D blocks) $b^{3D}$ closest to $b^{3D}$. These extended patches are centered at frame $I_k$ and the distance is written as

\[ d(b^{3D}, b^{3D}) = \sum_{i \in \{k-t, \ldots, k+t\}} ||P_i - P'_i||^2. \]

If the $K'$ closest 3D blocks were selected, then, as each extended patch contains $M$ 2D image patches, the group would contain $K' \cdot M$ 2D patches of size $n \times n$, from which patches containing occluded pixels should be removed. In order to guarantee a minimum number of patches in the subsequent denoising step, we select the closest 3D blocks until at least $K$ non-occluded 2D patches are obtained. In the second step of the algorithm, since the distances are computed over partially denoised blocks of patches, all the closest 3D blocks whose distance is below a pre-defined threshold are also selected.

**Denoising blocks of similar patches.** Each set of similar patches is denoised as described in Algorithm 7. First, the average value and standard deviation of the set of patches is computed, for each color channel. If the standard deviation is small, it is decided that the patches come from a
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region with uniform color (a "flat" zone). For large values of noise standard deviation some residual noise might be left in flat zones. This is a common issue to image denoising methods using an adaptive basis [12]. The reason is that in flat zones, the selection of patches is taking into account only noise because of the lack of geometry in these parts, which includes a bias in the selection process. In addition, the PCA analysis with pure noise patches and a reduced number of samples might generate principal values larger than expected. We apply the same solution to this issue as proposed in [12]. Whenever a set of patches is detected to be flat up to the noise oscillations, a denoising algorithm detailed in Algorithm 9 is used. Assuming that $K$ similar 2D patches are used, the PCA analysis of this set looks for the basis of $R^m$ better explaining its structure in the sense that most of the information describing all patches

If the patches do not belong to a flat zone the denoising algorithm detailed in Algorithm 9 is used. Assuming that $K$ similar 2D patches are used, the PCA analysis of this set looks for the basis of $R^m$ better explaining its structure in the sense that most of the information describing all patches
Algorithm 6: Get_Similar3D_Blocks

Input: set of aligned frames $\mathcal{I}^W$, set of aligned oracle frames (optional) $\mathcal{O}^W$, occlusion masks $\mathcal{M}$, pixel location $x$, index of reference frame $k$, set of valid frames in temporal neighborhood of reference frame $N_k^r$

Parameters: radius of spatial neighborhood $r$, radius of spatial search region $s$

Output: set of distances between spatio-temporal blocks $\mathcal{D}^{3D}$, set of spatio-temporal blocks $\mathcal{B}^{3D}$, set of spatio-temporal oracle blocks (if $\mathcal{O}^W$ provided) $\mathcal{O}^{3D}$

1. $\mathcal{D}^{3D} = \emptyset$ //Set of distances between spatio-temporal blocks
2. $\mathcal{B}^{3D} = \emptyset$ //Set of spatio-temporal blocks
3. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then $\mathcal{O}^{3D} = \emptyset$ //Set of spatio-temporal oracle blocks
4. $N_x^r = \{z \in \Omega ||x - z||_\infty \leq r\}$ //Spatial (squared) neighborhood of pixel $x$
5. $N_x^s = \{z \in \Omega ||x - z||_\infty \leq s\}$ //Spatial (squared) search region around pixel $x$
6. //For all pixels in search region
7. for $y \in N_x^s$ do
8. \[ a_y^{3D} = 0 \] //Distance between spatio-temporal blocks centered at $x$ and $y$
9. \[ b_y^{3D} = \emptyset \] //Spatio-temporal blocks centered at $y$
10. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then $a_y^{3D} = \emptyset$ //Spatio-temporal oracle blocks centered at $y$
11. for $j \in N_k^r$ do
12. \[ N_y^r = \{z \in \Omega ||y - z||_\infty \leq r\} \] //Spatial (squared) neighborhood of pixel $y$
13. \[ P_{x,j} = \{I_j^W(z), z \in N_y^r\} \] //Patch centered at $x$ in frame $j$ (1D array)
14. \[ P_{y,j} = \{I_j^W(z), z \in N_y^r\} \] //Patch centered at $y$ in frame $j$ (1D array)
15. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then
16. \[ O_{x,j} = \{O_j^W(z), z \in N_y^r\} \] //Patch centered at $x$ in oracle frame $j$
17. \[ O_{y,j} = \{O_j^W(z), z \in N_y^r\} \] //Patch centered at $y$ in oracle frame $j$
18. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then
19. \[ d_{x,y,j}^{2D} = ||O_{x,j} - O_{y,j}||_2^2 \] //Squared distance between oracle patches
20. else
21. \[ d_{x,y,j}^{2D} = ||P_{x,j} - P_{y,j}||_2^2 \] //Squared distance between patches
22. \[ a_y^{3D} = d_y^{3D} + d_{x,y,j}^{2D} \]
23. \[ b_y^{3D} = b_y^{3D} \cup P_{y,j} \]
24. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then $a_y^{3D} = a_y^{3D} \cup O_{y,j}$
25. \[ D^{3D} = D^{3D} \cup d_y^{3D} \]
26. \[ B^{3D} = B^{3D} \cup b_y^{3D} \]
27. if $\mathcal{O}^W$ then $O^{3D} = O^{3D} \cup a_y^{3D}$

is concentrated in a few vectors of the basis. The amount of information that each vector of the basis conveys is coded in the $n^2$ principal values. That is, by keeping only the coefficients associated to the most important vectors (the ones with highest corresponding principal value) we keep the maximum of information, while discarding coefficients related to less important vectors we remove noise as proposed in [21]. We refer the reader to [11] for a comprehensive review on PCA theory.

The computation of the PCA of a set of patches is equivalent to the Singular Value decomposition (SVD) of the matrix $X$ having $K$ rows and $n^2$ columns with each selected patch in a different row,

$$X = U\Sigma V^T,$$
where $U \Sigma$ are the coefficients in the new basis, $\Sigma$ is a diagonal matrix containing the square root of the principal values and each column of $V$ contains a principal vector, that is an element of the new basis. The decision of canceling a coefficient of a certain patch is not taken depending on its magnitude, but the magnitude of the associated principal value. A more robust thresholding is obtained by comparing the principal values to the noise standard deviation and canceling or maintaining the coefficients of all the patches associated to a certain principal direction. The denoised set of patches can be computed as

$$\tilde{X} = FU\Sigma V^T,$$

where $F$ is a $n^2 \times n^2$ diagonal matrix such that $F_{ii} = 1$ if $\Sigma_{ii} > \tau_{PCA}\sigma$ and zero otherwise. The whole patch is restored in order to obtain the final estimate by aggregation.

Algorithm 7: Patches_Denoising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>: set of similar 2D patches $S$, set of similar 2D oracle patches (optional) $S^O$, noise standard deviation $\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameters: flat parameter $f_{\text{flat}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>: denoised set of patches $\tilde{S}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(\mu, s) = \text{Average_Patches}(S)$ //Algorithm 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>if $s &lt; f_{\text{flat}} \times \sigma$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>//All the patches in $S$ have similar values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\tilde{S} = \mu$ //Assign the same constant value, per channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\tilde{S} = \text{PCA_Denoising}(S, S^O, \sigma)$ //Algorithm 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second “oracle” iteration. A second iteration of the algorithm is performed using the “oracle” strategy. Once the whole sequence has been restored, we re-apply the algorithm on the initial noisy sequence, but motion estimation and patch selection are performed on the result of the first iteration.

Let $\{I^W_{k-t}, \ldots, I^W_{k+t}\}$ and $\{I^W_{0,k-t}, \ldots, I^W_{0,k+t}\}$ be the warped noisy and initially restored images in a temporal neighborhood of $I_k$ where the optical flow has been computed using initially restored images $I^0_k$ and $I^0$. For each patch $P$ of the reference frame $I_k$, we consider the extended patches $b^{3D}$ and $b^{03D}$ referring to the extension to the temporal dimension of the patch and its counterpart in the already denoised sequence. The extended patches that will be selected as similar are the ones minimizing the distance

$$d(b^{03D}, b^{03D}) = \sum_{i \in \{k-t, \ldots, k+t\}} ||P^0_i - P^0_i||^2.$$ 

Now we have two different sets containing each one $K$ 2D patches of size $n \times n$. One set is formed by the patches of the noisy sequence and the other one by the corresponding patches of the already denoised sequence.

The PCA is computed in the set of already denoised patches. Let $X$ denote the matrix containing the selected patches of the noisy sequence as rows and $X^0$ the corresponding matrix with the same patches of the already filtered sequence. We compute the basis associated to $X^0$ making use of the SVD,

$$X^0 = U^0 \Sigma^0 V^{0T}.$$
Algorithm 8: Average_Patches

Input: set of 2D patches $S$

Output: average value $\mu$ (per channel), average standard deviation of the channels $s$

1 $\Omega_S$ = spatial domain of patches in $S$ // All the patches share the same spatial domain

// Initialize variables
2 if color patches then
3 $V^R = \emptyset$ // Set of red values in $S$
4 $V^G = \emptyset$ // Set of green values in $S$
5 $V^B = \emptyset$ // Set of blue values in $S$
else
6 $V = \emptyset$ // Set of gray values in $S$
7 for $x \in \Omega_S$ do
8 for $P \in S$ do
9 if color patches then
10 $P^R_x$ = red value of patch $P$ at pixel $x$
11 $P^G_x$ = green value of patch $P$ at pixel $x$
12 $P^B_x$ = blue value of patch $P$ at pixel $x$
13 $V^R = V^R \cup \{P^R_x\}$
14 $V^G = V^G \cup \{P^G_x\}$
15 $V^B = V^B \cup \{P^B_x\}$
else
16 $P_x$ = gray value of patch $P$ at pixel $x$
17 $V = V \cup \{P_x\}$
18 if color patches then
19 $\mu = \left(\text{average}(V^R), \text{average}(V^G), \text{average}(V^B)\right)$
20 $s = \text{average}\{\text{standard deviation}(V^R), \text{standard deviation}(V^G), \text{standard deviation}(V^B)\}$
else
21 $\mu = \text{average}(V)$
22 $s = \text{standard deviation}(V)$

This basis is adapted to the already denoised patches which are noise-free. The coefficients of the noisy patches are computed in this new basis and modified by a Wiener filter before reconstruction. Let $A^D$ be the modified coefficients of the noisy patches, computed as $A^D = F \circ A$, where $A = XV^0$ are the noisy coefficients, $\circ$ denotes the element-wise matrix product and $F$ is a $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix such that $F_{ij} = \frac{(A_{ij})^2}{(A_{ij})^2 + \sigma^2_R}$, with $\sigma^2_R = \tau_{PCA} \sigma$. Then, the denoised patches are computed as

$$\hat{X} = A^D V^0 T.$$

Color image denoising. Color images are denoised directly without the use of any color decorrelating transform. Each color patch is considered as a vector with three times more components than in the single channel case. The use of several frames makes the number of patches available much larger. This permits the use of PCA with color patches. That is, PCA adapts a color decorrelation transform for each group of patches, thus increasing the effectiveness of the model.

The final color algorithm is applied to vectorial patches, following the steps described in Algorithm 7. The optical flow is in this case computed on the gray version of the color images. Each
Algorithm 9: PCA_Denoising

**Input**: set of similar 2D patches $S$, set of similar 2D oracle patches (optional) $S^O$, noise standard deviation $\sigma$

**Parameters**: denoising threshold $\tau_{\text{PCA}}$

**Output**: denoised set of patches $\tilde{S}$

1 //Notation
2 $K = \text{number of patches in } S$ (= number of patches in $S^O$)
3 $n^2 = n \times n = \text{number of pixels in each patch}$ // $d = 1$ for gray patches and $d = 3$ for color patches
4 $N = d \times n^2 = \text{number of values in each patch}$

//Reorganize patches in $S$ in matrix form
5 $X = K \times N$ matrix containing the patches in $S$ as row vectors

if $S^O$ then

//Reorganize patches in $S^O$ in matrix form
7 $X^O = K \times N$ matrix containing the patches in $S^O$ as row vectors

//Get centered patches (their barycenter is the null vector)
8 $b = \text{Barycenter of patches in } X$ (row vector)
9 $X_c = X - 1 \cdot b$ // $1$ is a column vector of ones
10 (resp. $X^O_c = X^O - 1 \cdot b^O$, where $b^O$ is the barycenter of the patches in $X^O$)

//Denoise patches
11 $\sigma^2_R = (\tau_{\text{PCA}})^2 \times \sigma^2$

if $S^O$ then

13 $X^O_c = U^O \Sigma^O V^{O^T}$ // SVD decomposition of $X^O_c$
14 $A^O = U^O \Sigma^O$ // Coefficients of the patches in $X^O_c$ in the basis $V^O$
15 $A = X_c V^O = U \Sigma$ // Coefficients of the patches in $X_c$ in the basis $V^O$
16 $F = (F_{ij}), \quad F_{ij} = \frac{(A_{ij})^2}{(A_{ij})^2 + \sigma^2_R}$
17 $A^D = F \circ A$ // Modified coefficients ($\circ$ denotes element-wise matrix product)
18 $X^O_{cD} = A^D V^{O^T}$ // Denoised patches (centered)

else

19 $X_c = U \Sigma V^T$ // SVD decomposition of $X$
20 $A = U \Sigma$ // Coefficients of the patches in $X_c$ in the basis $V$
21 $F = \text{diagonal matrix}, \quad F_{ii} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Sigma^2_{ii} \geq \sigma^2_R \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
22 $A^D = FA$ // Modified coefficients
23 $X_{cD} = A^D V^T$ // Denoised patches (centered)
24 $X_D = 1 \cdot b + X_{cD}$ // Denoised patches (undo centering)
25 Store the denoised patches in $\tilde{S}$

channel is resampled with the same flow, and the same mask of occlusions is used for all the channels.

### 3 Parameters of the Method

Table 1 summarizes the parameters of the proposed denoising method.

- $\lambda$, is the main parameter of the optical flow computation. We use the method described in [18].
Table 1: Parameters of the method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Default value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>data attachment weight in optical flow computation</td>
<td>1st step: 0.075, 2nd step: 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_o$</td>
<td>factor for gray level values in occlusions mask</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_d$</td>
<td>factor for divergence values in occlusions mask</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{bin}}$</td>
<td>threshold for binarization of occlusions mask</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{dist}}$</td>
<td>threshold for left-right coherence in occlusions mask</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>radius of temporal neighborhood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>radius of spatial neighborhood</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>radius of spatial search region</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>minimum number of patches</td>
<td>Gray images: 55, Color images: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_d$</td>
<td>distance factor between 3D blocks</td>
<td>1st step: 0, 2nd step: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{\text{flat}}$</td>
<td>flat parameter</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{PCA}}$</td>
<td>threshold for PCA denoising/Wiener filtering</td>
<td>1st step: 1.8, 2nd step: 1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for this computation, and the rest of its parameters are set to the default values proposed in this article. This parameter determines the smoothness of the obtained flow, the smaller the parameter the smoother the result. In the first step of the denoising algorithm the input data are noisy and the obtained flow will be spatially unstable, for this reason we use a smaller value of the parameter to smooth the result. In the second step, since the flow is computed from denoised data, we use a higher value.

- $f_o$, this parameter controls the weight of the difference in gray levels in the occlusion mask ($\sigma_i = f_o \sigma_i$, Equation (1)). As the value of the parameter increases less importance is given to the gray level difference in determining that the flow is unreliable at a given pixel.

- $\sigma_d$, this parameter controls the weight of the divergence term in the occlusion mask (Equation (1)). This term is only accounted for when negative values of the divergence occur (since they are associated to the presence of occlusions). In this case, as the value of the parameter increases, less importance is given to the value of the divergence in determining that the flow is reliable at a given pixel.

- $\tau_{\text{bin}}$. Equation (1) produces a value in the range $(0, 1]$ associated to the reliability of the flow at a given pixel. Values close to 1 indicate that the flow is highly reliable while values close to 0 indicate the opposite. The parameter $\tau_{\text{bin}}$ defines the threshold between “reliable” (i.e. occluded) and “unreliable” pixels.

- $\tau_{\text{dist}}$, is the threshold for left-right coherence of the computed flow. If the difference between forward and backward flow at a given pixel is less than this threshold it is decided that the flow is reliable at the pixel, and unreliable otherwise.

- $t$, is the radius of the temporal neighborhood in the vicinity of each frame. This implies that $M = 2 \times t + 1$ frames are aligned and processed every time that a frame is denoised.

- $r$, is the radius of the (square) patch around each pixel used to perform the denoising process. This implies that each side of the patch has $n = 2 \times r + 1$ pixels, and that the total number of
pixels in the patch is \((2 \times r + 1) \times (2 \times r + 1)\).

- \(s\), is the radius of the area around each pixel where similar patches are searched for.

- \(K\), is the minimum number of similar 2D patches needed to perform the denoising process. This number depends on the dimension of the patches. For color images, since the dimension of the patches increases (three times more values are used per pixel), we use a higher value than for gray level images.

- \(f_d\), determines the maximum distance factor between 3D blocks (used only in the second step of the algorithm) below which all the patches in the block are used for denoising.

- \(f_{\text{flat}}\), determines the maximum standard deviation of the values of a 3D block of patches below which the patches in the block are considered as “flat” patches.

- \(\tau_{\text{PCA}}\). In the first step of the method this parameter determines which vectors in the basis obtained from PCA analysis of the set of similar patches are used to reconstruct the denoised patch. The higher the value of this parameter the less vectors are used to reconstruct the final result and the denoising effect is more apparent (at the expense of losing image details and textures). In the second step, the parameter determines the attenuation of each coefficient in the Wiener filtering.

The default values reported in the table were obtained by experimental evaluation and provide the best denoising results over a wide range of test images. These default parameters have been used in the experiments shown in the next section and also in the online demo associated to this paper.

In order to analyze how the variations of the different parameters affect the denoising result, we modify the value of one parameter at each time, while keeping the rest of parameters fixed to their default values. We use for our tests 5 gray sequences composed of 8 frames (sequences \textit{army}, \textit{cars}, \textit{girls}, \textit{statB} and \textit{taxi}, see Figure 4). White Gaussian noise is added to each sequence (we use two different levels of noise in the tests) and the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) with respect to the original (noise-free) sequences is computed for the central frame of each denoised sequence. The average of RMSE values over the 5 sequences is displayed in Figures 1 and 2 for each combination of parameters.

We observe (Figure 1 \textbf{a} and \textbf{b}) that the denoising results are quite stable to variations of the parameter \(\lambda\) of the optical flow algorithm, although slightly better results are obtained with the default values. A similar remark applies to the occlusion parameter \(f_o\) (Figure 1 \textbf{c}), provided that its value is high enough. Concerning the size of the patches (parameter \(r\), Figure 1 \textbf{d}), if they are too small or too large the denoising results deteriorate. The optimum result is obtained for \(5 \times 5\) patches \((r = 2)\). The results improve when the size of the temporal neighborhood \(t\) increases (Figure 1 \textbf{e}). It must be taken into account that a very short sequence (8 frames) was used in the tests and that for \(t = 5\) all the frames of the sequence were used for denoising. In practice, \(t = 7\) (15 frames) is used as the default parameter since larger values imply higher computation times. In Figure 1 \textbf{f} we observe that an excessive increase in the number of patches \(K\) used for denoising may lead to worse results in case of low levels of noise, while it improves the results when the noise level is higher. We use a compromise value of \(K = 55\) as default parameter.

In general, the denoising results deteriorate as the flat parameter \(f_{\text{flat}}\) increases (see Figure 2 \textbf{a}). This is because a high value of the parameter implies that more patches are replaced by a constant value in the denoised frames, producing an excessive smoothing. However, slightly better results are obtained with a relatively high value of the parameter for high levels of noise, which suggests that the denoising method based on PCA is unable to faithfully reconstruct uniform regions of the image when the noise is high. In Figure 2 \textbf{b} we observe that the denoising results are quite stable with
respect to parameter $f_d$. Finally, higher values of the threshold for PCA denoising (parameter $\tau_{\text{PCA}}$, Figure 2c and d) produce better results, when used in the first step of the method. In the second step, the results are quite stable with respect to the parameter.

## 4 Computational Complexity

It is difficult to give a theoretical estimate of the complexity of the proposed method due to the large number of algorithms involved. Instead, we give an empirical estimate. We proceed as follows: several versions of the same sequence are obtained at different resolutions by zooming out the original frames with decreasing zoom factors; the zoom factors are chosen such that the size (in pixels, i.e. width $\times$ height) of each frame is half the size of the frames in the previous sequence; we add noise to the sequence and apply the proposed denoising method, recording the computation time per frame.

We have chosen for this experiment the sequence $\text{statB}$ (see Figure 4), composed of 8 gray frames. The initial size of the frames is $740 \times 560 = 414400$ pixels. The obtained result, for two levels of noise ($\sigma = 20$ and $\sigma = 40$) is displayed in Figure 3-left. We observe a linear relation between the computation time and the size of the frames. We also observe that the computation time slightly increases with the level of noise. This is due to the fact that when noise increases less 3D blocks will be considered as “flat” and therefore they will be processed using Algorithm 9, which implies more computations than simply replacing the block by its average value. The reported computation times were obtained with an Intel Xeon CPU X7560 @ 2.27GHz and 32MB RAM.

Remark that some parts of the method are easily parallelizable using OMP directives\(^4\). This is possible in Algorithm 3, where all the neighbor frames of the reference frame can be aligned simultaneously. Parallelism is also used when computing divergences and gradients for the optical flow estimation and for image interpolation when warping the frames. Finally, the denoising of each pixel of a given frame (lines 10 to 20 in Algorithm 2) can also be computed in parallel. The use of OMP directives reduces significantly the computation time, as shown in Figure 3-right. In this case, using the 32 cores of the processor mentioned above, the computation times where reduced by a factor of 20.

## 5 Experimental Results

In this section we compare the proposed approach with state-of-the-art algorithms VBM3D [6] and VBM4D [14]. The Matlab implementations of VBM3D and VBM4D were obtained from the author’s web site and the default parameters were used in the tests.

Since VBM4D is the closest algorithm in the literature we briefly discuss the main differences in both the selection and filtering stages. VBM4D uses a motion estimation based on block matching while we use an optical flow estimation. There are two advantages in using optical flow: first the minimization is global and contains a regularization term, which makes the motion selection more independent of noise values. This might not be so important for other applications but it is crucial for denoising. The second difference is that optical flow provides subpixel accuracy, permitting a resampling of the images. This resampling improves the performance of the method. In the filtering stage, VBM4D uses a fixed transform based on bi-orthogonal wavelets and DCT. This is the same transform used by BM3D for images. However, in video we dispose of many more samples and we can take advantage of this fact by learning a better model for denoising. PCA allows us to obtain such an adaptive transform.

\(^4\)http://www.openmp.org/
Figure 1: Average RMSE over 5 sequences for varying values of the parameters.
We compare the performance of VBM3D, VBM4D and the proposed algorithm (SPTWO) both visually and numerically in several image sequences. Figure 4 displays the central frame of the used sequences. Some of the sequences are composed of 8 frames while others consist of 30 frames. We apply the proposed method with the default parameters listed in Table 1.

A Gaussian noise with increasing levels of standard deviation ($\sigma \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$) was added to the sequences (some examples are displayed in Figure 5), which were denoised using the compared methods.

The Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) with respect to the original (noise-free) sequences is displayed in Table 2. The values in the table correspond to the RMSE computed for the central frame of each sequence. Moreover, the average of these RMSE values, for each method and each noise level, is also displayed in the last column. Notice that the smaller RMSE values are obtained, in general, with the proposed algorithm. It is interesting to note that the performance of VBM3D is slightly better than VBM4D for low levels of noise (below $\sigma = 40$), while for higher levels of noise VBM4D is slightly better.

Figures 6, 7 and 8 display the denoising results of the compared algorithms. The figures also display the difference of the denoised image with the noisy one, and the difference of the denoised
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Figure 3: Computation time for increasing image sizes and different noise levels. Left, without parallelization of some algorithms. Right, with parallelization.

Figure 4: Central frame of the original sequences used in our tests. From left to right and from top to bottom: girls, army, truck, statB, taxi, iseq, army (color), cooper, girls (color), truck (color), gbus, gstennis, gsalesman, gbicycle. The last four sequences are composed of 30 frames, while the rest are composed of 8 frames.

image with the original one. The difference with the noisy image displays the noise removed by each algorithm. The absence of noticeable details in the removed noise should indicate the preservation of all texture and features of the original image. However, as illustrated by the denoised images, this
absence of details in the removed noise does not guarantee that all meaningful information of the original image has been kept. Indeed, the removed structure might be hidden by the noise. For this reason, we also display the image error, actually containing removed information from the original image.

A first visual inspection illustrates that VBM3D and VBM4D perform similarly and its main weakness is the excessive blurring of image details. Not only texture but also geometry may be removed by these approaches. This can be observed in the letters of the book in Figure 8. The proposed algorithm recovers better all image details in all three cases, even in the presence of strong noise.

![Figure 5: Three examples of noisy sequences (the central frame of the sequence is shown). From left to right: $\sigma = 20$, $\sigma = 30$ and $\sigma = 50$.](image)

### Table 2: RMSE results. The values correspond to the RMSE computed for the central frame of each sequence. The average RMSE for each method and each noise level is displayed in the last column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>girls</th>
<th>army</th>
<th>truck</th>
<th>statB</th>
<th>taxi</th>
<th>iseq</th>
<th>gbus</th>
<th>gstennis</th>
<th>gsalesman</th>
<th>gbicycle</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 10$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 20$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 30$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 40$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 50$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Denoising results for the *gbus* sequence with $\sigma = 20$. First row, from left to right: noisy frame, VBM3D (RMSE=9.03), VBM4D (RMSE=8.87), SPTWO (RMSE=6.27). Second row: detail of the above images. Third row: differences with respect to the noisy frame. Fourth row: differences with respect to the original (noise-free) frame.
Figure 7: Denoising results for the army sequence with $\sigma = 30$. First row, from left to right: noisy frame, VBM3D (RMSE=6.06), VBM4D (RMSE=6.02), SPTWO (RMSE=4.99). Second row: detail of the above images. Third row: differences with respect to the noisy frame. Fourth row: differences with respect to the original (noise-free) frame.
Figure 8: Denoising results for the iseq sequence with $\sigma = 50$. First row, from left to right: noisy frame, VBM3D (RMSE=7.63), VBM4D (RMSE=7.34), SPTWO (RMSE=4.92). Second row: detail of the above images. Third row: differences with respect to the noisy frame. Fourth row: differences with respect to the original (noise-free) frame.
5.1 Results on Color Images

Four sequences, composed of 8 frames each, have been used to test the performance of the proposed algorithm on noisy color sequences (see Figure 4).

The results of the compared algorithms, in terms of RMSE, are shown in Table 3. In this case we display the average RMSE value of the three channels. Again, it can be observed that the proposed method outperforms state-of-the-art methods VBM3D (in this case the color version of the algorithm) and VBM4D. Surprisingly, for color sequences the performance of VBM3D is better than that of VBM4D, even for high levels of noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σ</th>
<th>army</th>
<th>cooper</th>
<th>dog</th>
<th>truck</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>VBM3D</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VBM4D</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTWO</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: RMSE results for color sequences. The values correspond to the RMSE (averaged over the three channels) computed for the central frame of each sequence. The average RMSE for each method and each noise level is displayed in the last column.

Finally, Figures 9 and 10 show details of the denoising results. As in the case of gray level images, the proposed method preserves better the textures and details of the scene, while VBM3D and VBM4D tend to blur them.

6 Conclusions

We have described a denoising algorithm combining motion estimation and patch-based denoising algorithms. Motion compensation permits the use of spatio-temporal patches for a more robust comparison while the use of PCA for patch denoising preserves texture and details. Implementation details have been provided and the influence of the different parameters in the denoising result has been analyzed. Finally, the results of the proposed method have been compared with the state-of-the-art. The obtained results (both qualitative and quantitative) illustrate the gain in performance of the proposed approach.
Figure 9: Denoising results for the army color sequence with $\sigma = 30$. First row, from left to right: noisy frame, VBM3D (RMSE=5.54), VBM4D (RMSE=6.40), SPTWO (RMSE=4.70). Second row: detail of the above images. Third row: differences with respect to the noisy frame. Fourth row: differences with respect to the original (noise-free) frame.
Figure 10: Denoising results for the cooper color sequence with $\sigma = 50$. First row, from left to right: noisy frame, VBM3D (RMSE=12.01), VBM4D (RMSE=12.49), SPTWO (RMSE=10.38). Second row: detail of the above images. Third row: differences with respect to the noisy frame. Fourth row: differences with respect to the original (noise-free) frame.
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