A New Method of Image Compression Using Irreducible Covers of Maximal Rectangles

YING CHENG, S. SITHARAMA IYENGAR, AND RANGASAMI L. KASHYAP, FELLOW, IEEE

Abstract—In recent years there has been a tremendous spurt in research and activity in finding efficient compression techniques for image processing applications. Particularly when an image is structured over a nonrectangular region, it is always advantageous to define a method of covering a region by minimal numbers of maximal rectangles. Towards this objective, we analyze the binary image compression problem using irreducible cover of maximal rectangles. We also give a bound on the minimum rectangular cover problem for image compression under certain conditions that previously have not been analyzed. It is demonstrated that for a simply connected image, the irreducible cover proposed here uses less than four times the number of the rectangles in a minimum cover. With *n* pixels in a square, the parallel algorithm of obtaining the irreducible cover presented in the paper uses $(n/\log n)$ concurrent-read-exclusive-write (CREW) processors in $O(\log n)$ time.

Index Terms-Covering algorithms, image compression, maximal rectangles.

I. INTRODUCTION

EFFECTIVE methods of representation of binary dig-tial images are required in many image processing tasks. Currently hierarchical representations like quadtrees and octtrees are very popular [8], [9]. One criterion of evaluation of different representations is the degree of information compression achieved by the scheme. The information contained in any representation can be measured by the length of the program needed to transmit the same. For instance, in quadtrees, one needs to transmit the program corresponding to the quadtree including declarations of the leaf nodes which correspond to the pixels or groups of pixels having a "one." It is well known that the *minimum* code length required for transmitting an $n \times n$ *n* binary image is $2 \log_2 n$. The image compression efficiency associated with a particular representation can be measured by the ratio of the length of the program to the above minimum, namely $2 \log_2 n$. Typically, the ratio is greater than one. The closer the ratio is to one, the greater will be the degree of image compression achieved.

The quadtree corresponds to dividing an image into

Manuscript received June 30, 1987; revised September 30, 1987. Y. Cheng was supported in part by a grant from the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund. R. L. Kashyap was supported in part by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research.

Y. Cheng was with the Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. He is now with AT&T Bell Laboratories, Crawfords Corner Road, Holmdel, NJ 07733.

S. S. Iyengar is with the Department of Computer Science, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

R. L. Kashyap is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette. IN 47907.

IEEE Log Number 8819886.

nonoverlapping squares by particular tree scanning procedure. In this paper, we explore the possibility of describing each connected part of an image by means of irreducible and maximal rectangles which may be overlapping. A rectangle is described by a quadruple, namely the sizes of the two sizes and two coordinates of some specific corner (say northwest). The image will be described by an unordered set of the quadruples corresponding to the various rectangles. We believe that the compression achieved by these schemes like this is, in general, superior to those obtained by quadtrees since 1) they do not involve any additional algorithms like tree traversal or ordering, and 2) the basic unit in quadtrees are squares, not rectangles. These schemes may also be useful for real-time dynamization, i.e., dynamically altering the representation in real time as the image changes in real time. However, we do not explore the aspect in this paper.

Ferrari *et al.* [3] considered the representation of images via a partition with (nonoverlapping) maximal rectangles. Moitra *et al.* [6] used maximal irreducible cover with squares, the squares being possibly overlapping. However, Masek showed that the constriction of minimal covers with rectangles is an NP-complete problem. For a broader treatment on this, see [2]. In this paper, we plan to describe an image by an irreducible cover made up of maximal rectangles. We also present an algorithm to find an irreducible cover. With *n* pixels in a square, the parallel implementation of the algorithm can be executed with $(n/\log n)$ concurrent-read-exclusive-write (CREW) processors in $O(\log n)$ time. Hence, the parallel algorithm is optimal.

It is important to point out that the cover generated is irreducible, but not minimal. The usefulness of the representation is intimately connected to the question of the ratio of the number of rectangles in the irreducible cover of this paper to the number of rectangles in a *minimal* cover. The smaller the ratio, the greater will be the usefulness of the representation. We show that for a simply connected image, the number of rectangles in the irreducible cover is less than four times the number of rectangles in a minimal cover.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II describes some basic definitions and the main focus of our problem. Section III describes the greedy algorithm and there we develop motivation for the proposed method. Section IV describes an overview of the proposed algorithm with a detailed proof to show that our

0098-5589/88/0500-0651\$01.00 © 1988 IEEE

method produces an irreducible cover for the image. Section V describes a parallel version of the algorithm. Section VI discusses the number of rectangles used in the irreducible cover and that of a minimum cover under some restricted conditions. Section VII concludes the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we consider a binary image as an array $P[0 \cdots m, 0 \cdots m]$ of binary valued pixels, where $m = \sqrt{n} + 1$. For convenience, we assume that the image is only within $P[1 \cdots \sqrt{n}, 1 \cdots \sqrt{n}]$. The value of a pixel $P_{i,j}$ is represented as both *true/false* or its synonymous value *black/white*. In Fig. 1, we give an example of an image and an irreducible cover of rectangles for it.

A rectangle can be represented as rect < row, column, size1, size2>, where row and column are the coordinates of the northwest corner pixel of the rectangle, and size1 and size2 are the numbers of rows and columns in the rectangle. A black rectangle is *maximal* if it is not contained in any other black rectangle. In this paper, a rectangle always means a black rectangle. A collection C of rectangles is called a *cover* of the image if every black pixel is contained in at least one of the rectangles in C. A cover C is *irreducible* if no proper subset of C is a cover of the image. A greedy algorithm to obtain an irreducible cover from a cover will be given in Section III.

Neighborhood Characterization of Black Pixels

A black pixel $P_{i,i}$ is a top (respectively, bottom, left, or right) pixel if the pixel $P_{i-1,j}$ (respectively, $P_{i+1,j}$, $P_{i,j-1}, P_{i,j+1}$,) is not black. It is easy to show that a rectangle is maximal if and only if it contains top, bottom, left, and right pixels. A column of black pixels is called a maximal column if it is not contained in any other column of black pixels. Hence, a rectangle is a maximal column if and only if it contains only one column and it contains a top pixel and a bottom pixel. For example, in Fig. 1, the pixels $P_{6,5}$ and $P_{7,5}$ form a maximal column and pixels $P_{3,2}$, $P_{4,2}$, $P_{5,2}$ form another one. Of course, the maximal column is uniquely determined by its top pixel. If the top pixel is $P_{i,j}$, we write the maximal column as $\max_{col} < i, j >$. Hence, the two maximal columns in Fig. 1 we just mentioned are denoted as max col < 6, 5 and max_col<3, 2>, respectively. The notation $\max_{col} < i, j > is defined only when P_{i,j} is a top pixel.$ Similarly, we can define maximal rows. A set of black pixels is said to be *covered* by a collection of rectangles if every pixel in the set is contained in at least one rectangle of this collection. A sequence of consecutive top (respectively, bottom, left, right) pixels is called a top (respectively, bottom, left, right) edge. Fig. 2 illustrates these terms.

A cover with minimum number of rectangles is called a *minimum cover*. Clearly, every minimum cover is irreducible. The vice versa is not true, an irreducible cover need not be minimal. Also, since every rectangle is contained in at least one maximal black rectangle, we can obtain a minimum cover with maximal rectangles from



Image





Fig. 2. Cover with maximal rectangles a, b, c, d, e, f, g.

any minimum cover. An ideal way to store binary image data is to use a minimum cover. However, it is a difficult problem to find a minimum cover for an image. The problem that whether an image has a minimum cover with k rectangles is known to be NP-complete (Masek's unpublished work cited in [2]). Therefore, it is reasonable to use irreducible covers instead of minimum covers. In this paper, we present an algorithm to find an irreducible cover. For a simply connected image, i.e., a connected image without holes, we show that the irreducible covers use less than four times the number of rectangles in a minimum cover.

Lemma 1: Every maximal column is contained in a unique maximal rectangle.



Fig. 3. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 1.

Proof: Let $\max_{col} < t, j > be a maximal column$ with *m* rows with $P_{t,i}$ as its top pixel and $P_{b,i}$ as its bottom pixel with b = t + m - 1 as in Fig. 3. Now let *l* be the smallest integer such that P_{k_1,k_2} are black pixels for all t $\leq k_1 \leq b$ and $l \leq k_2 \leq j$. There exists an integer p such that $t \le p \le b$ and $P_{p,l-1}$ is not a black pixel. Hence, $P_{p,l}$ is a left pixel as in Fig. 3. Let r be the largest integer such that P_{k_1,k_2} are black pixels for all $t \le k_1 \le b$ and j $\leq k_2 \leq r$. There exists an integer q such that $t \leq q \leq b$ and $P_{q,r+1}$ is not a black pixel. Hence, $P_{q,r}$ is a right pixel. Pixels P_{k_1,k_2} , $t \le k_1 \le b$, $l \le k_2 \le r$ form the maximal rectangle rect < t, l, m, r - l + 1 >. It contains the maximal column max_col < t, j >. Since this is essentially the unique way to construct a maximal rectangle which contains max_col < t, j >, the maximal rectangle we obtained is the unique one containing $\max_{col < t, j > .}$ Q.E.D.

The unique maximal rectangle containing max-_col < t, j > is denoted by $\Re_{i,j}$. We note that different maximal columns may be contained in the same maximal rectangle. For example, in Fig. 1, $\Re_{2,4} = \Re_{2,5} =$ rect <2, 3, 2, 4>.

Finally, we note that, for sets A and B, we denote the set of elements of A which is not in B by $A \setminus B$.

III. GREEDY ALGORITHM

The greedy algorithm can be easily described as follows. We begin with a cover \mathcal{C} of rectangles. When we find one rectangle \mathcal{R} which is covered by $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{R}\}$, we delete this rectangle from the cover. That is, $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{R}\}$. We do this process until we cannot find any one in the updated cover \mathcal{C} , which satisfies the above condition. Each time when we delete one rectangle, we know that the updated cover is a true *cover*. Hence, at the end, the set of rectangles left is also a cover. It is an irreducible cover because this is the reason that we stop the process. *Greedy Algorithm:*

input: A cover C of rectangles for a binary image.

output: A subset C_1 of C which forms an irreducible cover for the image.

 $\mathcal{C}_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{C}$

while (there exists $M \in \mathbb{C}_1$ which is covered by $\mathbb{C}_1 \setminus \{M\}$) $\mathbb{C}_1 \leftarrow \mathbb{C}_1 \setminus \{M\}$

This above algorithm is sequential in nature since we can delete one rectangle at a time. In the next section, we shall outline a cover so that we can perform the deletion concurrently.

IV. NEW ALGORITHM

We sketch an outline of our algorithm for finding an irreducible cover for any image.

Algorithm A:

input: binary image $P_{i,j}$, $1 \le i, j < m$.

output: an irreducible cover of maximal rectangles for the image.

1) Determine all maximal rectangles which contain some maximal columns. This collection of maximal rectangles is denoted by C. Here, for a given maximal column, we find the unique maximal rectangle which contains this column by the method given in the proof of Lemma 1. We note that we may get the same rectangle from different columns.

2) Eliminate repetitions of the maximal rectangles obtained in the previous step. After this elimination, every rectangle of C is uniquely determined by one particular maximal column, or equivalently, by one particular top pixel.

3) Determine those rectangles \mathbb{R} of \mathbb{C} whose corresponding maximal column are covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathbb{R}\}$. This collection of maximal rectangles is denoted by \mathfrak{D} .

4) Finally, $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$, the collection of rectangles in \mathbb{C} but not in \mathbb{D} , is an irreducible cover.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ is an irreducible cover.

Lemma 2: C is a cover of the image.

Proof: Let $P_{i,j}$ be a black pixel. Let t be the smallest integer such that $P_{k,j}$ are black pixels for all $t \le k \le i$. Since $P_{t-1,j}$ is not black, $P_{t,j}$ is a top pixel. Similarly, let b be the largest integer such that $P_{k,j}$ are black pixels for all $i \le k \le b$. Then $P_{i,j}$ is a bottom pixel. Hence, pixels $P_{k,j}$, $t \le k \le b$, form the maximal column max_col < t, j >, which contains $P_{i,j}$. By Lemma 1, max_col < t, j > is contained in the unique maximal rectangle $\Re_{t,j} \in \mathbb{C}$. This proves that \mathbb{C} is a cover for the image. Q.E.D.

In the next lemma, we prove that if the maximal rectangle \Re_{i_2,j_2} covers a pixel P_{i,j_1} , which is contained in a maximal column max_col < i_1 , $j_1 >$, then \Re_{i_2,j_2} covers the row of \Re_{i_1,j_1} containing P_{i,j_1} . Fig. 4 illustrates this result.

Lemma 3: Let $\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} = \operatorname{rect} < i_1, \ l_1, \ r_1, \ c_1 > \text{ and } \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} = \operatorname{rect} < i_2, \ l_2, \ r_2, \ c_2 > .$ Suppose that $P_{i,j_1} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2}$ $\cap \max_\operatorname{col} < i_1, \ j_1 > .$ Then $r_2 \le r_1$ and $P_{i,k} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2}$ for all k with $l_1 \le k \le l_1 + c_1 - 1$.

Proof: Suppose that $i_2 < i_1$. Then \Re_{i_2,j_2} contains the pixel P_{i_1-1,j_1} . This pixel is not black since P_{i_1,j_1} is a top pixel. However, \Re_{i_2,j_2} contains black pixels only. Hence, $i_2 \ge i_1$. Similarly, since $P_{i_1+r_1-1,j_1}$ is a bottom pixel, we have that $i_2 + r_2 - 1 \le i_1 + r_1 - 1$. Hence, $r_2 \le r_1$. Also, $P_{i_2,k} \in \Re_{i_2,j_2}$ for all k with $l_2 \le k \le l_2 + c_2 - 1$. This implies that $l_2 \le l_1$ and $l_2 + c_2 - 1 \ge l_1 + c_1 - 1$. Therefore, $c_1 \le c_2$ and $P_{i,k} \in \Re_{i_2,j_2}$ for all k with $l_1 \le k \le l_1 + c_1 - 1$. Cherry $G_{i_2,k} \ge l_1 + c_1 - 1$.

Since the sequential and parallel versions to implement



Fig. 4. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 3.

step 2 of algorithm A are essentially different, we will simply assume, in this section, that we choose one particular max_col < i, j > in each rectangle \Re of \mathbb{C} and call the top pixel $P_{i,j}$ an *active* pixel. Hence,

$$\mathfrak{C} = \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} | P_{i,j} \text{ is active} \}$$

and if P_{i_1,j_1} and P_{i_2,j_2} are distinct active pixels, then $\Re_{i_1,j_1} \neq \Re_{i_2,j_2}$. By definition,

$$\mathfrak{D} = \left\{ \mathfrak{R}_{i,j} | P_{i,j} \text{ is active and } \max_col < i, j > \\ \text{is covered by } \mathfrak{C} \setminus \left\{ \mathfrak{R}_{i,j} \right\} \right\}.$$
(4.1)

Lemma 4: For an active $P_{i,j}$, $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} = \text{rect} < i, l, r, c >$ is covered by $\mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$ if and only if max_col < i, j >is covered by $\mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$.

Proof: Suppose that max_col < i, j > is covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$. For fixed i_1 with $i \le i_1 \le i + r - 1$, $P_{i_1,j} \in \max_col < i, j >$. Hence, there exists $\mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} \ne \mathfrak{R}_{i,j}$ such that $P_{i_1,j_1} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2}$. By Lemma 3, \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} contains $P_{i_1,k}$ for all k with $l \le k \le l + c - 1$. This proves that $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} = \operatorname{rect} < i, l, r, c > \operatorname{is}$ covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$. The other part of the lemma is trivial. Q.E.D.

Now we can prove our main result in this section that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ is an irreducible cover.

Theorem 1: $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$ is an irreducible cover of the image.

Proof: We first prove that $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$ is a cover. So, let $P_{i,j}$ be a black pixel. By Lemma 2, $P_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} = \text{rect} < i_1, l_1, r_1, c_1 > \text{ for an active } P_{i_1,j_1}$. Among all these possible \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} , we choose one with minimum r_1 . That is, $P_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} = \text{rect} < i_1, l_1, r_1, c_1 > \text{ and if } P_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i',j'} = \text{rect} < i', l', r', c' >$, then $r \leq r'$. Now we claim that $\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$. Suppose it is not so. Then $\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\max_{col} < i_1, j_1 > \text{ is covered by } \mathbb{C}\setminus\{\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1}\}$ by (4.1).

By Lemma 4, \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} is covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1}\}$. Since $P_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1}$, we have that $i_1 \leq i \leq i_1 + r_1 - 1$. Consider the black pixel P_{i,j_1} which is covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1}\}$. Say, $P_{i,j_1} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} = \text{rect} < i_2, l_2, r_2, c_2 >$, with $\mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} \neq \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1}$. By Lemma 3, $r_2 \leq r_1$ and $P_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2}$. By the minimality of \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} , $r_2 = r_1$. Now, both \mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} and \mathfrak{R}_{i_2,j_2} contain P_{i,j_1} and have the same number of rows. Hence, they both contain max_col $< i_1, j_1 >$. By Lemma 1, they are the same rectangle, a contradiction. This proves that $P_{i,j}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{R}_{i_1,j_1} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$. Hence, $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ is a cover. To prove that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ is an irreducible cover, we have to

To prove that $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$ is an irreducible cover, we have to prove that $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\mathbb{D}\cup\{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\})$ is not a cover for every $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\notin\mathbb{D}$ with active $P_{i,j}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}\cup\{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$ is a cover for some $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\notin\mathbb{D}$ with active $P_{i,j}$. Then $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$ is also a cover. In particular, max_col< *i*, *j* > is covered by $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$. By definition, $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\in\mathbb{D}$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of this theorem. Q.E.D.

V. PARALLEL IMPLEMENTATION OF ALGORITHM A

The first step in algorithm A is to determine all maximal rectangles which contain some maximal columns. Parallel algorithms 1 and 2 return maximal rectangles $\Re_{i,j} \leftarrow$ rect $< top[i, j], left_bound[i, j], col_size[i, j], row_ size[i, j] > . For an illustration, please see Fig. 5.$

Algorithm 1:

input: binary image $P_{i,j}$, $1 \le i, j < m$.

output: boundaries left[i, j], right[i, j] of the maximal row containing black pixel $P_{i,j}$. boundaries top [i, j], bottom [i, j] of the maximal column containing black pixel $P_{i,j}$.

```
forall 1 \le i, j < m pardo

if P_{i,j} then

begin

left[i, j] \leftarrow \min(\{l| \land_{0 < l \le k \le j} P_{i,k}\})

right[i, j] \leftarrow \max(\{r| \land_{j \le k \le r < m} P_{i,k}\})

top[i, j] \leftarrow \min(\{t| \land_{0 < t \le k \le i} P_{k,j}\})

bottom[i, j] \leftarrow \max(\{b| \land_{i \le k \le b < m} P_{k,j}\})

end

od

end;
```

...

Algorithm 2: input: output of Algorithm 1.

output: maximal rectangles $\Re_{i,j}$ and maximal columns max_col < *i*, *j* > which contain top pixels $P_{i,j}$.

forall
$$1 \le i, j < m$$
 pardo
if $(P_{i,j}$ and not $(P_{i-1,j})$) then
begin
 $left_bound[i, j] \leftarrow max(\{left[k, j] | top[i, j] \le k \le bottom[i, j]\})$
 $right_bound[i, j] \leftarrow min(\{right[i,k] | top[i, j] \le k \le bottom[i, j]\})$
 $col_size[i, j] \leftarrow bottom[i, j] - top[i, j] + 1$
 $row_size[i, j] \leftarrow right_bound[i, j] - left_bound[i, j] + 1$
 $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} \leftarrow rect < top[i, j], left_bound[i, j], col_size[i, j], row_size[i, j] >$
max_col < i, j > \leftarrow rect < i, j, 1, row_size[i, j] >
end
od

end;

CHENG et al.: IMAGE COMPRESSION USING COVERS OF RECTANGLES



Fig. 5. Illustration for Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 can be executed with n^2 concurrent-readwrite processors in O(1) time. As suggested in Moitra and Moitra [6], it can also be executed with $(n/\log n)$ concurrent-read-exclusive-write processors in $O(\log n)$ time as follows. It can be obtained by allocating one processor to every pixel whose row index is a multiple of log n. We describe the method to obtain right[i, j] only. The other three can be obtained similarly. In $\log n$ sequential steps, each processor links each of the (next $\log n$) pixels to the rightmost one which either terminates a horizontal sequence of black pixels and/or is log *n* columns away. Then in at most log n parallel steps, all the processors find the right end of horizontal strips which are wider than log n columns. Finally, in a sequential log n steps, each processor links each of the (next at most log n) pixels which belongs to a sequence of black pixels wider than $\log n$ columns, to the rightmost one which terminates the sequence.

Similar arguments show that the comparisons in Algorithm 2 can be executed in log n time with $(n/\log n)$ CREW processors.

The purpose of the next algorithm is to implement the second step in Algorithm A.

Algorithm 3:

input: output of Algorithm 2.

output: activities $A_{i,j}$ of top pixels $P_{i,j}$. (Explained below).

There are two methods to achieve the goal. In the first

Algorithm 4:

method, we use array Boolean variables $B[i_1, j_1, v_1, v_2]$, $1 \le i, j, v_1, v_2 \le m$, and the CREW model. All top pixels $P_{i,j}$ concurrently attempt to write $B[i_1, j_1, v_1, v_2]$, where $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} = B[i_1, j_1, v_1, v_2]$. Those assess to $B[i_1, j_1, v_1, v_2]$ successfully can get $A_{i,j} \leftarrow 1$. Otherwise, $A_{i,j} \leftarrow 0$. This can be done in log *n* time by using $n/\log n$ processors.

The second method to achieve the goal in Algorithm 3 can be described as follows. We first define a linear ordering on the rectangles we obtained in Algorithms 1 and 2 as follows. Let $\Re_{i,j} = \text{rect} < v_1, v_2, r_1, c_1 > \text{ and } \Re_{i',j'} = \text{rect} < v'_1, v'_2, r'_1, c'_1 > .$ Define $\Re_{i,j} < \Re_{i',j'}$ if and only if

$$(v_1, v_2, r_1, c_1, i, j) < (v'_1, v'_2, r'_1, c'_1, i', j')$$

in the lexicographical order. Now we can apply the optimal random sorting algorithm of Reif [7], which can be executed in $O(\log n)$ time using $(n/\log n)$ P-RAM processors, to eliminate repetitions among the rectangles obtained in Algorithms 1 and 2. That is, among those rectangles $\Re_{i,j}$ with the same rect $< v_1, v_2, r_1, c_1 >$, we choose the one with the smallest j. (All i are the same for the same rectangles.) For this choice, we say that the pixel $P_{i,j}$ is active. Or say $A_{i,j} = 1$ if $P_{i,j}$ is active and 0 otherwise. Therefore, every rectangle obtained in Algorithms 1 and 2 is uniquely determined by an active pixel $P_{i,j}$. We can also apply Leighton's deterministic method [5], to achieve the goal by using n processors in time log n. This apparently uses more processes.

In Algorithm 4, we assign a sign sign[i', j'] to each pixel so that it is 1 if $P_{i',j'} \in (\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} \setminus \max_col < i, j >)$ for some active $P_{i,j}$. Now, for every active pixel $P_{i,j}$, we have that sign[i', j'] = 1 for all $P_{i',j'} \in \max_col < i, j >$ if and only if $\max_col < i, j >$ is covered by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathfrak{R}_{i,j}\}$. Equivalently, $\mathfrak{R}_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{D}$. For this $P_{i,j}$, we change its activity $A_{i,j}$ from 1 to 0 in Algorithm 5. Finally, those $P_{i,j}$ with $A_{i,j} = 1$ form the irreducible cover $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ according to Theorem 1.

output: sign[i, j] for active $P_{i,j}$. The meaning of sign[i, j] is explained above. forall $1 \le i, j < m$ pardo sign[i, j] = 0od forall $1 \le i, j < m$ pardo if $A_{i,i}$ then $sign[i', j'] \leftarrow 1$ for all $P_{i', j'} \in \mathbb{R}_{i, j} \setminus \max_col < i, j >$ od end; Algorithm 5: input: output of Algorithms 2, 3, and 4. output: change some $A_{i,i}$ from 1 to 0. Those $\mathfrak{R}_{i,i}$ with $A_{i,j} = 1$ form the irreducible cover $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$. forall $1 \le i, j < m$ pardo if $(A_{i,j} \text{ and } \land \{sign[i', j'] \mid P_{i',j'} \in \max_col < i, j > \})$ then $A_{i,j} \leftarrow 0$ od end;

input: output of Algorithms 2 and 3.

To sketch the sequential algorithm, we first assume that all edges of the image are stored. For a fixed top edge and a fixed bottom, we find all bottom edges under this top edge. Now we fix one of these bottom edges and consider the pair of the top edge and the bottom edge. For a pair of top edge and bottom edge, we construct a maximal rectangle as in Lemma 1. To eliminate repetitions, we simply check all maximal rectangles. This can be done in $O(k^2)$ time, where k is the number of rectangles. To determine those rectangles in D, we can also fix one rectangle and check all other rectangles in C. Again, this can be done in $O(k^2)$ time.

VI. GEOMETRY OF BINARY IMAGES

In this section, we shall state an upper bound on the cardinality of \mathbb{C} , $\#\mathbb{C}$, which is the number of rectangles in the cover obtained in Algorithm A. This bound is also an upper bound for the cardinality of the irreducible cover $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$. After presenting a formula for the number of convex and concave corners of a simply connected binary image, we shall prove that $\#\mathbb{C}$ is at most $4 \cdot \#\mathbb{M} - 3$ for any minimal cover \mathbb{M} .

In order to obtain those bounds we mentioned above, we shall introduce some concepts in the geometry of binary images. Although these concepts are pretty much well known in the field of geometry, the authors know no references for our particular need in the study of binary images.

We first define convex and concave corners. Each pixel has four corners. Each corner of a black pixel $P_{i,j}$ has three neighbor pixels. The two neighbor pixels which share common edges with $P_{i,j}$ are called *edge neighbors* of the corner and the other one the *vertex neighbor* of the corner. Fig. 6 illustrates the definitions.

A corner of a black pixel $P_{i,j}$ is called a *convex corner* if both its edge neighbors are white pixels. It is called a *concave corner* if both its edge neighbors are black pixels and its vertex neighbor is a white pixel. Fig. 7 illustrates the definitions.

Let

$$P_{i_1,j_1}, P_{i_2,j_2}, \cdots, P_{i_l,j_l}$$
 (6.1)

be a sequence of black pixels. It is a *path* if $P_{ik,jk}$ and $P_{ik+1,jk+1}$ share a common edge, for all $1 \le k \le t - 1$. A path (6.1) is *simple* if all the black pixels are distinct. The path is a *cycle* if $P_{i_1,j_1} = P_{i_2,j_3}$. It is a *simple cycle* if the black pixels in (6.1) are distinct, except for $P_{i_1,j_1} = P_{i_2,j_3}$, which are identical pixels. We can use a simple cycle to partition the whole set of pixels into three parts: the cycle itself, and pixels inside the cycle and pixels outside the cycle, called the inner and outer part, respectively. An example to illustrate the concept is given in Fig. 8.

An image is said to be *connected* if there is a path connecting any two black pixels. A *connected component* is a subset of black pixels which is connected, and is maximal subject to the connected condition. Clearly, an image can be partitioned into connected components. An image is connected if and only if it has exactly one connected



Fig. 6. E_1 and E_2 are edge neighbors of corner 1 in Pixel $P_{i,j}$. V_1 is the vertex neighbor of corner 1 in Pixel $P_{i,j}$.



Fig. 7. The image has ten convex corners, labeled 1, and two concave corners, labeled 2.



Fig. 8. Inner and outer parts of a cycle.

component. A connected image is said to be *simply connected* if the inner parts of all simple cycles consist of no white pixels.

For the remainder of this section, we let $\alpha(P)$ be the number of convex corners of the image P, $\beta(P)$ the number of concave corners, and $\gamma(P)$ be the number of connected components. We also denote $\mathcal{C}(P)$ as the cover of P obtained in Algorithm A.

Theorem 2: If all connected components of an image *P* are simply connected, then $\alpha(P) = \beta(P) + 4\gamma(P)$.

Proof: Let Γ be the collection of images such that all their connected components are simply connected. We use induction on #P, the number of black pixels in P, to prove the statement that

$$\alpha(P) = \beta(P) + 4\gamma(P) \tag{6.2}$$

for $P \in \Gamma$. If #P = 1, then P consists of a single black pixel. In this case, (6.2) is certainly true.

Now we assume that $P \in \Gamma$, and $\#P \neq 0$. Consider a maximal left edge 3 of P. Then 3 is a maximal column in P. By Lemma 1, 3 is contained in a unique maximal rectangle \Re . Let \Re be the right edge of the rectangle \Re . \Re contains a right pixel. Let \Re' be the unique maximal col-



Fig. 9. Illustration for the proof of Theorem 2.

umn containing \mathfrak{N} . For an illustration of these terms, please see Fig. 9.

If $\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{N}'$, then we have three possible situations as shown in Fig. 10(a)-(c). We note that we omit the situation which is a reflection of (c). If $\mathfrak{N} \neq \mathfrak{N}'$, then we have two possible situations as shown in Fig. 10(d) and (e). We note that we omit the situation which is a reflection of (d). In each of these situations, we delete a black rectangle, as shown in Fig. 10(a)-(e). It is easy to check that the resulting image P' is also in Γ . Since #P' < #P, (6.2) holds for P' by induction hypothesis. By using those information we obtained in Fig. 10, we can easily check that (6.2) holds for P. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. Q.E.D.

The proof of the next result is similar to the proof of Theorem 2 and involving more cases.

Theorem 3: If all connected components of an image P are simply connected, then $\#\mathbb{C}(P) \le \beta(P) + \gamma(P)$.

Proof: Let Γ be the collection of images such that all their connected components are simply connected. We use induction on #P, the number of black pixels in P, to prove the statement that

$$#\mathbb{C}(P) \le \beta(P) + \gamma(P) \tag{6.3}$$

for $P \in \Gamma$. If #P = 1, then P consists of a single black pixel. In this case, (6.3) is certainly true.

Now we assume that $P \in \Gamma$, and $\#P \neq 0$. As we did in the proof of Theorem 2, we consider a maximal left edge 3 of P. Then 3 is a maximal column in P. By Lemma 1, 3 is contained in a unique maximal rectangle \Re . Let \Re be the right edge of the rectangle \Re . \Re contains a right pixel. Let \Re' be the unique maximal column containing \Re . For an illustration of these terms, please see Fig. 9.

If $\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{N}'$, then we have seven possible situations as shown in Fig. 11(a)-(g). We note that we omit situations which are reflections of (c), (d), and (f). We also note that these seven situations come from the consideration of the northeast and southeast corners of the rectangle \mathfrak{R} . The corners can be convex, concave corners, or can be none of the above two types. We assume that there are t right edges of P in \mathfrak{N} .

If $\mathfrak{N} \neq \mathfrak{N}'$, then we have two possible situations as shown in Fig. 11(h) and (i). We note that we omit the situation which is a reflection of (h). In each of these situations, we delete a black rectangle, as shown in Fig.



(a) $\alpha(P') = \alpha(P) - 4, \beta(P') = \beta(P), \gamma(P') = \gamma(P) - 1.$



(b) $\alpha(P') = \alpha(P) + 2, \beta(P') = \beta(P) - 2, \gamma(P') = \gamma(P) + 1.$



(c) $\alpha(P') = \alpha(P) - 1, \beta(P') = \beta(P) - 1, \gamma(P') = \gamma(P).$



(d) $\alpha(P') = \alpha(P) - 1, \beta(P') = \beta(P) - 1, \gamma(P') = \gamma(P).$



(e) $\alpha(P') = \alpha(P) - 2, \beta(P') = \beta(P) - 2, \gamma(P') = \gamma(P).$ Fig. 10. Illustration for the proof of Theorem 2.

11(a)-(i). It is easy to check that the resulting image P' is also in Γ . Since #P' < #P, (6.3) holds for P' by induction hypothesis. By using those information we obtained in Fig. 11, we can easily check that (6.3) holds for P. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. Q.E.D.



Corollary 1: If all connected components of an image *P* are simply connected, then $\#\mathbb{C}(P) \leq \alpha(P) - 3\gamma(P)$. Proof: This result follows from Theorems 2 and 3.

Q.E.D.

Corollary 2: If an image P is simply connected, then $\#\mathbb{C}(P) \leq \alpha(P) - 3$. In particular, $\#\mathbb{C}(P) \leq 4$. $\#\mathfrak{M}(P) - 3$, for every minimum cover \mathfrak{M} .

Proof: The first part follows from Corollary 1 directly. To prove the second part, we fix a minimum cover \mathfrak{M} . Clearly, every convex corner of P is covered by at least one rectangle in M. Also, every rectangle contains at most four convex corners of P. Therefore, $\alpha(P) \leq 4$ • #M. This proves the corollary. Q.E.D.

This corollary also implies the following result.

Theorem 4: Suppose that an image P is simply connected and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ is the irreducible cover obtained in Algorithm A. Then $\#(\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}) \leq 4 \cdot \#\mathfrak{M} - 3$, for every minimum cover M.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The search for an optimal covering for a binary image is fundamental to many image processing applications. In this paper, we propose an efficient way of compressing

digital image using irreducible covers of maximal rectangles. The principal results are the following.

1) If all connected components of an image P are simply connected, then the number of convex corners =number of concave corners $+4 \cdot$ the number of connected components of the image.

2) For a simply connected image, the cover C proposed in this paper uses less than four times the number of rectangles in a minimum cover. This bound is also an upper bound for the number of rectangles used in the irreducible cover $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$.

3) The parallel algorithm of finding the irreducible cover $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{D}$ uses $(n/\log n)$ concurrent-read-exclusivewrite (CREW) processors in $O(\log n)$ time.

4) The geometry of binary images described in this paper is very unique in characterizing the mathematical correspondence of the minimum cover problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Chaiken, D. J. Kleitman, M. Saks, and J. Shearer, "Covering regions by rectangles," SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods, vol. 2, pp. 394-410, Dec. 1981.
- [2] H. E. Conn and J. O'Rourke, "Some restricted rectangle covering problems," Dep. Comput. Sci., Johns Hopkins Univ., Tech. Rep. JHU-87/13, June 1987.
- [3] L. Ferrari, P. V. Sankar, and J. Sklansky, "Minimal rectanglar partitions of digitized blobs," Computer Vision, Graphics, Image Processing, vol. 28, pp. 58-71, Oct. 1981.
- [4] D. S. Franzblau and D. J. Kleitman, "An algorithm for constructing regions with rectangles: Independence and minimum generating sets for collections of intervals," in Proc. 16th Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput., 1984, pp. 167–174.[5] T. Leighton, "Tight bounds on the complexity of parallel sorting," in
- Proc. 16th Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput., 1984, pp. 71-80. D. Moitra and A. Moitra, "Irreducible cover for binary images using [6] maximal squares," Aug. 1987, unpublished manuscript.
- [7] J. H. Reif, "An optimal parallel algorithm for integer sorting," in *IEEE Symp. Foundations Comput. Sci.*, 1985, pp. 496-503. [8] H. Samet, "The quadtrees and related hierarchical data structure,"
- ACM Comput. Surveys, vol. 16, June 1984.
- [9] D. S. Scott and S. S. Iyengar, "TID-A translation invariant data structure for storing images," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 29, pp. 418-429, May 1986.



Ying Cheng received the B.Sc. degree in mathematics from National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, in 1976, and the M.S., M.Ph., and Ph.D. degrees in mathematics from Yale University. New Haven, CT, in 1979, 1980, and 1981, respectively

He was a Dickson Instructor of Mathematics at the University of Chicago from 1981 to 1983. In August 1983 he joined the faculty of the Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. He is currently with AT&T Bell

Laboratories, Holmdel, NJ. His research interests include communication networks, coding theory, data compression, graph theory, combinatorics, algebra, and applications of algebraic methods.

S. Sitharama Ivengar, for a photograph and biography, see this issue, p. 610.

Rangasami L. Kashyap (M'70-SM'77-F'80), for a photograph and biography, see this issue, p. 610.