

# How to Compare Noisy Patches? Patch Similarity Beyond Gaussian Noise

Charles-Alban Deledalle · Loïc Denis · Florence Tupin

Received: 27 June 2011 / Accepted: 17 February 2012 / Published online: 1 March 2012  
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

**Abstract** Many tasks in computer vision require to match image parts. While higher-level methods consider image features such as edges or robust descriptors, low-level approaches (so-called image-based) compare groups of pixels (patches) and provide dense matching. Patch similarity is a key ingredient to many techniques for image registration, stereo-vision, change detection or denoising. Recent progress in natural image modeling also makes intensive use of patch comparison.

A fundamental difficulty when comparing two patches from “real” data is to decide whether the differences should be ascribed to noise or intrinsic dissimilarity. Gaussian noise assumption leads to the classical definition of patch similarity based on the squared differences of intensities. For the case where noise departs from the Gaussian distribu-

tion, several similarity criteria have been proposed in the literature of image processing, detection theory and machine learning.

By expressing patch (dis)similarity as a detection test under a given noise model, we introduce these criteria with a new one and discuss their properties. We then assess their performance for different tasks: patch discrimination, image denoising, stereo-matching and motion-tracking under gamma and Poisson noises. The proposed criterion based on the generalized likelihood ratio is shown to be both easy to derive and powerful in these diverse applications.

**Keywords** Patch similarity · Likelihood ratio · Detection · Matching

---

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s11263-012-0519-6) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

---

C.-A. Deledalle (✉) · F. Tupin  
Institut Telecom, Telecom ParisTech, CNRS LTCI, 46,  
rue Barrault, 75634 Paris cedex 13, France  
e-mail: [charles-alban.deledalle@telecom-paristech.fr](mailto:charles-alban.deledalle@telecom-paristech.fr)

F. Tupin  
e-mail: [florence.tupin@telecom-paristech.fr](mailto:florence.tupin@telecom-paristech.fr)

L. Denis  
Université de Lyon, 42023 Saint-Etienne, France  
e-mail: [loic.denis@univ-st-etienne.fr](mailto:loic.denis@univ-st-etienne.fr)

L. Denis  
UMR5516, Laboratoire Hubert Curien, CNRS, 42000  
Saint-Etienne, France

L. Denis  
Université de Saint-Etienne, Jean Monnet, 42000 Saint-Etienne,  
France

## 1 Introduction

Patches are small image parts that capture both texture and local structure information. Though being crude low-level features compared to higher level descriptors, they have led to very powerful approaches in a wide range of computer vision tasks and image processing models.

To classify textures, Varma and Zisserman (2003) have shown that patch-based classifiers lead to better performance than higher-level features computed using filter banks. State-of-the-art methods for texture synthesis (i.e., generation of a larger image from a given texture image) or inpainting (i.e., filling missing information in images) heavily rely on the concept of patch (e.g. Efros and Freeman 2001; Liang et al. 2001; Kwatra et al. 2003; Criminisi et al. 2004). Image editing based on user-defined constraints is also performed through a decomposition into image patches (Cho et al. 2009).