EVALUATING IMAGE CONTRAST: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW AND COMPARISON OF METRICS

Cristian AVATAVULUI[1]

Marcel PRODAN[2]

Abstract

Image contrast plays a pivotal role in the realm of digital imaging and computer vision, significantly influencing the visual quality and subsequent interpretation of images. Evaluating and quantifying this contrast has emerged as a critical need in a wide spectrum of applications, including medical imaging, remote sensing, and digital photography, among others. This paper offers a comprehensive review of various metrics available for the evaluation of image contrast, focusing on their underlying formulas, interpretations, advantages, disadvantages, and pertinent usage scenarios. The study compares metrics from histogram-based, spatial frequency-based, and statistical perspectives. It explores the computational complexity, accuracy, and robustness of these metrics, including their sensitivity to noise and other image degradations. Further, we discuss the real-world applications of these metrics in the domains of image enhancement, image quality assessment, and image compression. We also outline current challenges and propose future research directions for developing more robust and versatile contrast metrics. Our findings underscore the importance of an appropriate choice of contrast metric for effective image analysis and processing in various application settings.

Keywords: Image Contrast, Contrast Metrics, Histogram-based Metrics, Spatial Frequency-based Metrics, Statistical Contrast Metrics, Image Processing, Computer Vision, Image Quality Assessment

JEL Classification: C80, C65

1. Introduction

1.1. Background on the Importance of Image Contrast in Visual Perception and Computer Vision

Image contrast, a crucial element of digital imaging and visual perception, directly impacts the clarity, sharpness, and overall quality of an image. It serves as the foundation for distinguishing different objects and features within an image [1][2]. In computer vision,

[1] PhD student., University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania, cristian.avatavului@stud.acs.pub.ro

[2] PhD Student, Engineer, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania, marcel.prodan@stud.acs.pub.ro

image contrast is central to image segmentation, feature extraction, object detection, and image recognition tasks [3][5]. A vital aspect of image enhancement techniques like histogram equalization [4] and Retinex-based methods [6], is their capacity to adjust image contrast to improve visual quality and facilitate subsequent image processing tasks [2].

Moreover, image contrast is pivotal in various application domains. In medical imaging, for instance, the fine contrast nuances can be indicative of health abnormalities [1][7]. Similarly, in remote sensing, the contrast within satellite imagery can reveal critical details about terrestrial phenomena [7]. Furthermore, in digital photography, image contrast significantly affects the aesthetic appeal and perception of images [5]. Thus, image contrast bears crucial importance in both visual perception and the field of computer vision [2][7].

1.2. Need for Accurate and Efficient Metrics for Evaluating Image Contrast

Given the crucial role of image contrast, the ability to accurately measure and quantify it is of paramount importance. This requirement is not merely for image enhancement techniques but also for evaluating image quality and performance of image processing algorithms [8][9][12]. Accurate contrast metrics serve as benchmarks for assessing the effectiveness of image enhancement algorithms and can guide the development of new methodologies [13][14].

Contrast metrics also play a significant role in automatic thresholding and segmentation, where accurate contrast evaluation can lead to improved results [10][14]. Consequently, the use of inappropriate or inaccurate contrast metrics can result in the suboptimal performance of these algorithms and lead to errors in subsequent image analysis tasks [9][14].

1.3. Overview of the Various Metrics Discussed in the Paper

In light of the importance of accurate contrast evaluation, this paper presents a detailed overview of several widely used contrast metrics. These include both global and local histogram-based metrics [4], spatial frequency-based metrics such as Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC) and Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC) [3], and statistical metrics like Root Mean Square (RMS) Contrast, Michelson's Contrast, and Weber's Contrast [11][12].

Each of these metrics has unique characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages that make them suitable for specific applications and scenarios. We will discuss these metrics in detail, providing mathematical formulas, interpretations, and examples of usage scenarios. This thorough review aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of these metrics, illuminating their importance, potential applications, and the ongoing need for their advancement [15].

2. Image Contrast: Concept and Importance

2.1. Definition and Theory of Image Contrast

Image contrast is defined as the difference in color or luminescence that distinguishes one object in an image from other objects and the backdrop [1][2]. More formally, it refers to the difference in intensity between the lightest and darkest parts of an image, which enables differentiation between features and objects within the image [3]. The concept of contrast is rooted in the human visual system's inherent sensitivity to differences in light intensity, enabling it to discern shapes, textures, and boundaries in visual scenes [2].

Contrast is usually quantified using a contrast metric, which provides a scalar value representing the degree of contrast within an image [11][12]. These metrics leverage various mathematical and statistical approaches, including spatial frequency analysis, statistical variance, and histogram analysis [4][10].

2.2. Role and Importance of Image Contrast in Various Domains

Image contrast holds paramount importance across a wide array of application domains. In medical imaging, for instance, subtle differences in contrast can indicate disease conditions, such as tumors in MRI scans or calcifications in mammograms [1][7]. Thus, effective contrast analysis can aid in early disease detection and diagnosis [1].

In remote sensing, contrast within satellite imagery can provide significant insights into environmental phenomena. Differences in contrast can help distinguish between different land use types, detect changes in vegetation cover, and identify areas affected by natural disasters [7].

Furthermore, in digital photography and graphic design, image contrast is a crucial aspect of image aesthetics [5]. High-contrast images often appear more vibrant and engaging, whereas low-contrast images can create a muted, softer impression [5]. Therefore, photographers and designers frequently manipulate image contrast to achieve desired visual effects.

2.3. Overview of the Impact of Low/High Contrast on Image Perception and Analysis

The level of contrast within an image profoundly influences its perception and interpretation. High contrast can enhance an image's sharpness, making features more distinguishable [3]. This can be particularly beneficial in applications such as remote sensing or surveillance, where distinguishing fine details is essential [7].

However, excessively high contrast can lead to saturation, where the brightest parts of an image appear washed out, and the darkest parts lose detail, a phenomenon often termed 'clipping' [5][13].

On the other hand, low contrast can make an image appear dull or hazy, causing difficulties in discerning features or objects within the image [1][2]. This is frequently encountered in medical imaging or under poor lighting conditions in photography [1][5]. But, similarly, certain artistic effects might leverage low contrast intentionally.

Therefore, the manipulation and evaluation of image contrast is a balancing act, dependent on the specific requirements of each application domain. Developing a thorough understanding of image contrast and its metrics is thus critical for optimal image analysis and processing [14][15].

3. Metrics for the Evaluation of Image Contrast

3.1. Definition and Understanding of Contrast Metrics

Contrast metrics are mathematical techniques designed to quantify the contrast of an image, representing it as a scalar value [3][12]. These metrics can evaluate contrast on a global scale—analyzing the entire image—or a local scale—focusing on specific regions or objects within an image [4].

While there are myriad contrast metrics, they typically fall under three primary categories: histogram-based, spatial frequency-based, and statistical metrics [3][4,][11]. Histogram-based metrics evaluate the distribution of pixel intensities across an image, with a wider distribution indicating higher contrast [4]. Spatial frequency-based metrics assess the rate of change of pixel intensities across an image, with faster changes denoting higher contrast [3]. Statistical metrics, on the other hand, typically calculate the dispersion of pixel intensities, such as through standard deviation or root mean square calculations [11].

Each metric comes with its own advantages and disadvantages, making them suitable for specific scenarios and applications [12][14]. Moreover, each metric may interpret contrast slightly differently, reflecting the various aspects of contrast that can be important in different contexts [9][15].

3.2. Importance of Contrast Metrics in Image Processing and Computer Vision

Contrast metrics are fundamental tools in the realm of image processing and computer vision. They serve as the basis for numerous applications, including image enhancement, quality assessment, and compression [1][6][13].

In image enhancement, contrast metrics can guide the adjustment of contrast to improve image quality. For example, histogram equalization techniques aim to spread out the histogram of an image to enhance contrast, based on the histogram-based contrast metric [4]. Similarly, Retinex-based enhancement methods manipulate the spatial frequencies within an image to adjust contrast, following the theory behind spatial frequency-based metrics [6].

Contrast metrics also serve as benchmarks for evaluating the performance of image processing algorithms. For instance, they can assess the effectiveness of enhancement techniques in improving image contrast [8][14]. In the field of image compression, contrast metrics can guide the compression process to preserve important contrast details and assess the quality of compressed images [1][13].

Furthermore, contrast measures are important in computer vision applications such as segmentation, feature extraction, and object recognition. They provide a means to quantify and compare the contrast of different regions or objects, aiding in distinguishing these features within an image [2][10].

Given their extensive applications and vital role in image analysis, a thorough understanding of contrast metrics is imperative. In the following sections, we will delve into the specifics of various contrast metrics, discussing their formulas, interpretations, advantages, disadvantages, and usage scenarios [15].

3.3. Histogram-based Contrast Metrics

3.3.1. Global Histogram Contrast

Global histogram contrast is a broadly used metric for evaluating image contrast that focuses on the overall intensity distribution of the image [4]. The principle underlying this metric is that an image with a wider distribution of intensities, covering the complete range from black to white, exhibits high contrast. Conversely, an image with pixel intensities clustered around a narrow range is considered to have low contrast.

The global histogram contrast (GHC) is typically calculated using the following formula:

$$GHC = Max(I) - Min(I)$$

where $Max(I)$ and $Min(I)$ represent the maximum and minimum pixel intensity values in the image I, respectively [4].

In terms of interpretation, a high GHC value suggests a high-contrast image, while a low GHC value implies a low-contrast image. A picture with pixel intensities that vary from 0 to 255, for example, would have a GHC value of 255, indicating great contrast. On the other hand, an image with all pixel intensities clustered around 128 would have a GHC value close to 0, suggesting low contrast [4].

Global histogram contrast provides several advantages. It is computationally efficient, as it only requires a single pass over the pixel intensities in the image. Furthermore, it is intuitive and straightforward to understand, making it a commonly used metric in many image processing tasks [4].

However, GHC also has its limitations. As a global metric, it is unable to account for local contrast variations within an image. Therefore, two images with the same global contrast could have vastly different local contrast details [3][14]. Additionally, GHC is sensitive to outliers, such as noise, which can artificially inflate the contrast estimate [13].

Despite these limitations, GHC remains useful in many scenarios, particularly in image enhancement applications such as histogram equalization techniques. By spreading out an image's pixel intensity histogram, these strategies strive to increase the global histogram contrast, hence boosting the image's visual quality [4]. Moreover, GHC is beneficial in preliminary image analysis, providing a quick and efficient estimate of the overall image contrast [1][2].

3.3.2. Local Histogram Contrast

Unlike the Global Histogram Contrast, which provides a single contrast estimate for the entire image, Local Histogram Contrast (LHC) aims to quantify contrast variations within smaller regions of the image [4][8]. By analyzing contrast locally, LHC is capable of capturing more intricate contrast details, making it suitable for images with significant local contrast variations.

The LHC is frequently calculated by breaking the image into smaller chunks or regions and then calculating the histogram contrast for each of these regions separately. A common formula for calculating LHC is as follows:

$$LHC(x,y) = Max\big(I(x,y)\big) - Min(I(x,y))$$

where $Max\big(I(x,y)\big)$ and $Min(I(x,y))$ signify the highest and minimum levels of pixel intensity in the image I in the block situated at (x, y), respectively [4].

The interpretation of LHC is similar to GHC, with higher values indicating higher local contrast. However, as LHC provides a contrast estimate for each block, it results in a contrast map rather than a single scalar value, giving a more detailed depiction of the contrast distribution within the image [4][8].

The primary advantage of LHC is its ability to account for local contrast variations. This can provide a more nuanced understanding of the image contrast, particularly in images with complex intensity distributions or localized features [8][14]. Additionally, as LHC analyzes contrast on a block-by-block basis, it is less sensitive to outliers and noise compared to GHC [13].

However, LHC also has its disadvantages. It is computationally more intensive than GHC, given the need to calculate the histogram for multiple blocks. Furthermore, the choice of block size can significantly impact the contrast estimate, with smaller blocks capturing more local details but potentially being more sensitive to noise [9][14].

LHC is commonly employed in image segmentation, feature extraction, and object detection tasks in computer vision, where capturing local contrast details is crucial [10]. It is also valuable in image enhancement techniques that focus on improving local contrast, such as adaptive histogram equalization methods [6]. Furthermore, LHC can provide a more accurate estimate of image quality in scenarios where local contrast variations are significant, such as in medical imaging or high dynamic range (HDR) imaging [7][15].

3.4. Spatial Frequency-based Contrast Metrics

3.4.1. Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC)

Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC) is a spatial frequency-based metric that quantifies image contrast by examining the frequency spectrum of the image. This metric is built upon the theory that high-frequency components correspond to rapid changes in pixel intensities—indicative of high contrast—while low-frequency components correspond to slow intensity changes—suggestive of low contrast [3][12].

The FTC metric is computed by first performing the Fourier Transform (FT) on the image and then examining the frequency spectrum that results. The FT transfers it from the spatial domain to the frequency domain, with each point in the modified image representing a different frequency from the original image. The magnitude of each point in the transformed image signifies the contribution of that frequency to the overall image [3].

The FTC can be computed using the following formula:

$$FTC = \sum |FT(I(u,v))|^2$$

where $FT(I(u,v))$ represents the Fourier Transform of the image I at the frequency coordinate (u,v) [3]. The square of the magnitude (denoted by $|.|^2$) is summed over all frequencies to yield the FTC.

In terms of interpretation, a high FTC value implies that the image contains a high proportion of high-frequency components, suggesting high contrast. Conversely, a low FTC value indicates a predominance of low-frequency components, suggesting low contrast [12].

One of the main advantages of FTC is its ability to account for contrast variations at different scales, given its focus on the frequency spectrum [3][12]. Furthermore, unlike histogram-based metrics, FTC is not sensitive to shifts in pixel intensities, as the FT is based on relative intensity changes rather than absolute intensity values [3].

However, FTC also has its limitations. As a global metric, it might overlook local contrast variations within the image. Additionally, FTC is computationally more intensive than histogram-based metrics, given the need to perform a Fourier Transform [9][14].

FTC is commonly used in image enhancement methods that focus on manipulating the spatial frequencies within an image to adjust contrast, such as the Retinex-based methods

[6]. Additionally, it is employed in quality assessment tasks that require a comprehensive understanding of the frequency spectrum, such as the evaluation of compressed images or the quality assessment of medical images [1][13][15].

3.4.2. Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC)

Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC) is another spatial frequency-based metric that measures image contrast using the wavelet transform, a tool that analyzes frequency content at different scales and locations within the image. This allows the WTC to provide a more localized contrast evaluation compared to FTC [3][7].

The WTC is calculated by first applying the Wavelet Transform (WT) to the image, creating a series of sub-band images each representing different frequency scales and spatial locations within the original image [3].

A common formula for computing WTC is as follows:

$$WTC = \sum |WT(\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}))|$$

where $WT(\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}))$ stands for the Wavelet Transform of the image I at the spatial coordinate (x, y), and the sum is taken over all the sub-band images [3].

The interpretation of WTC is similar to FTC, with higher WTC values indicating a high proportion of high-frequency components and thus high contrast, and lower WTC values indicating a predominance of low-frequency components and thus low contrast [7].

WTC's capacity to perform a multiscale and localized contrast analysis, capturing more fine contrast features inside an image, is one of its key benefits [7][14]. It is also less sensitive to noise compared to FTC, as the wavelet transform inherently suppresses noise within higher frequency sub-bands [5][14]. However, similar to FTC, WTC is computationally more intensive than histogram-based metrics due to the need to perform a Wavelet Transform [9]. Furthermore, the choice of wavelet function can significantly impact the contrast estimate, making WTC somewhat dependent on the choice of parameters [3][9].

WTC is commonly employed in tasks requiring multiscale and localized contrast analysis, such as image segmentation and feature extraction in computer vision [10]. Additionally, it is useful in image enhancement methods focusing on manipulating the spatial frequencies at different scales, such as wavelet-based methods [6]. Moreover, in quality assessment tasks that necessitate a comprehensive understanding of local frequency content—such as in medical imaging or texture analysis—WTC provides a powerful tool [7][15].

3.5. Statistical Contrast Metrics

3.5.1. Root Mean Square (RMS) Contrast

Root Mean Square (RMS) contrast is a statistical contrast metric that quantifies image contrast by measuring the standard deviation of pixel intensities. The principle behind RMS contrast is that images with a larger dispersion of pixel intensities, and hence larger standard deviation, have higher contrast [11].

The RMS contrast is typically computed using the following formula:

$$RMS\ Contrast = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M \cdot N} \sum (I(x,y) - \mu)^2}$$

where $I(x,y)$ indicates the intensity of the pixel at location (x, y) in the image, μ is the mean intensity of the image, and M and N are the dimensions of the image [11].

The interpretation of RMS contrast is straightforward: a higher RMS contrast value indicates a larger dispersion of pixel intensities and thus higher contrast, while a lower RMS contrast value indicates a smaller dispersion and thus lower contrast [11].

RMS contrast has the advantage of providing a statistical measure of contrast, which can supplement the information offered by histogram- and frequency-based metrics [3][11]. Furthermore, as a simple mathematical operation, the RMS contrast is computationally efficient and easy to implement.

However, similar to the Global Histogram Contrast, RMS contrast is a global metric and hence can overlook local contrast variations within an image [3][14]. Furthermore, it is sensitive to extreme values and noise, which can artificially inflate the standard deviation and thus the contrast estimate [13].

RMS contrast is useful in many scenarios, particularly in preliminary image analysis and quality assessment tasks, where it provides a quick and efficient estimate of image contrast [1][2]. It can also be used in conjunction with other contrast metrics to provide a more comprehensive analysis of image contrast. For example, it can complement histogram-based metrics in image enhancement applications, where the objective is to spread out the pixel intensity histogram and increase the standard deviation of pixel intensities [4].

3.5.2. Michelson's Contrast

Michelson's Contrast, named after the American physicist Albert A. Michelson, is a historical measure of contrast typically used for simple periodic images such as sinusoidal gratings. It is determined using the variation between the image's maximum and minimum intensity [14].

The Michelson's Contrast (MC) can be calculated using the following formula:

$$MC = \frac{I_{max} - I_{min}}{I_{max} + I_{min}}$$

where I_{max} stands out for the image's greatest intensity, and I_{min} stands out for the minimum intensity [14].

Interpreting MC is straightforward: a value close to 1 signifies high contrast, while a value close to 0 indicates low contrast. However, this measure of contrast is best suited to images with two predominant intensity levels [14].

One of the key advantages of Michelson’s Contrast is its simplicity. It offers a clear, easy-to-calculate measure of contrast. However, its simplicity is also a limitation, as it does not consider the distribution or frequency of different intensities within the image [3]. Moreover, MC is sensitive to extreme values, with a single very bright or very dark pixel potentially having a disproportionate effect on the contrast estimate [9][13].

Given these characteristics, Michelson’s Contrast has found usage in scenarios involving periodic or binary images, or those with two main intensity levels. It has also been employed in the field of visual perception research, where simple stimuli with periodic intensity patterns are often used [14]. However, for complex real-world images, other contrast metrics might provide a more comprehensive evaluation [1][2][11].

3.5.3. Weber's Contrast

Weber's Contrast, named after the pioneering psychophysicist Ernst Heinrich Weber, is a perceptual measure of contrast that quantifies the change in intensity relative to the background intensity. It is frequently used in psychophysics and vision research to assess an object's visibility against its backdrop. [14].

The Weber's Contrast (WC) can be computed using the following formula:

$$WC = \frac{I - I_b}{I_b}$$

where I represent the intensity of the object, and I_b represents the background intensity [14].

The interpretation of WC is as follows: a higher WC value means the object is more distinguishable from the background, indicating high contrast, while a lower WC value means the object is less distinguishable, indicating low contrast [14].

One of Weber's Contrast's main advantages is that it reflects the human visual system's relative sense of contrast. It simulates the finding that our perception of contrast is affected not only by the distinction in intensity between an item and its backdrop, but also by the intensity of the background [14]. However, a limitation of Weber's Contrast is that it's only defined for images or scenarios with a clear object and background, which limits its applicability to complex real-world images [3][9]. Additionally, it assumes a linear response to contrast, which may not accurately reflect the human visual system's response in all conditions [13].

Weber's Contrast is extensively used in psychophysics and vision research to assess object visibility and simulate the human visual system's reaction to contrast [14]. It's also employed in image processing jobs that need a measure of contrast that reflects perceptual visibility, such as watermarking and steganography, where the goal is to hide information inside an image in an unnoticeable to the human eye [10].

4. Comparison of Contrast Metrics

Contrast metrics have been extensively used in image processing, computer vision, and related fields to evaluate and enhance the quality of images. However, the effectiveness of each metric can vary based on several factors including computational complexity, accuracy, robustness, and sensitivity to noise and other image degradations. In this part, we compare the contrast measures mentioned in this work across different dimensions.

4.1. Comparison in terms of Computational Complexity

When it comes to computational complexity, global metrics such as Global Histogram Contrast, RMS Contrast, Michelson’s Contrast, and Weber's Contrast typically have a lower computational load. They either require basic statistical calculations or simple operations on pixel intensities [1][2][11].

On the other hand, spatial frequency-based metrics such as Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC) and Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC) are more computationally demanding. They require performing either a Fourier Transform or a Wavelet Transform on the image, operations which can be computationally intensive, especially for larger images [3][7][9].

4.2. Comparison in terms of Accuracy and Robustness

The accuracy and robustness of a contrast metric depend largely on the type and complexity of the images being evaluated. Global metrics can provide accurate contrast estimates for simpler images but can overlook local contrast variations in more complex images [3][14].

Conversely, FTC and WTC can provide more accurate and robust contrast estimates for complex images as they capture local variations in contrast. However, the choice of the Fourier or Wavelet function and other parameters can significantly impact the accuracy of these metrics [3][9].

4.3. Comparison in terms of Sensitivity to Noise and Other Image Degradations

Regarding sensitivity to noise and other image degradations, histogram-based and statistical metrics tend to be sensitive to extreme values and noise, which can artificially inflate the contrast estimate [13].

Spatial frequency-based metrics such as FTC and WTC are generally less sensitive to noise, as the Fourier and Wavelet Transforms inherently suppress noise within higher frequency bands [5][7]. However, they can be sensitive to other image degradations such as blurring, which can affect the image's high-frequency components [6][8].

The choice of contrast metric depends on the specific requirements of the application, including the computational resources available, the complexity of the images, and the level of noise and other degradations present in the images. While no single metric is universally superior, a combination of metrics can often provide a comprehensive and accurate evaluation of image contrast [3][14][15].

5. Practical Implications and Applications

Contrast measurements are important in a variety of real-world applications, which include but are not restricted to image enhancement, imagery evaluation, image compression, and others. They are integral to the analysis and optimization of image quality and also heavily impact the effectiveness of several image processing tasks.

5.1. Role of These Metrics in Real-World Applications

In image enhancement, the goal is to augment the visual quality of images, often by manipulating the image contrast. Image enhancement algorithms make use of contrast metrics to assess the quality of an improved image and direct the improvement process [11]. For instance, metrics such as the RMS Contrast can provide feedback on the overall contrast of an image, while Local Histogram Contrast, FTC, and WTC can provide spatially varying contrast details that guide local enhancement procedures [2][3][9].

Image quality assessment is another domain where contrast metrics are pivotal. In tasks such as watermarking and steganography, the objective is often to insert data into an image in a manner that's imperceptible to the human eye. Contrast metrics, particularly those that model human contrast perception like Weber's Contrast, are crucial in assessing the perceptual impact of these manipulations [10][13].

Contrast metrics also play a role in image compression, which involves reducing the storage size of an image without significantly compromising its quality. The contrast measure used can influence the apparent quality of the compressed image as well as the compression ratio obtained. [1][11].

5.2. Discussion on How the Choice of Contrast Metric Can Impact the Outcome of Such Applications

The choice of contrast metric can significantly impact the effectiveness and outcomes of the above-mentioned applications. For instance, in image enhancement, using a global contrast metric might result in an image with good overall contrast but poor local contrast in specific regions. On the other hand, using a local contrast metric like the FTC or WTC might result in an image with enhanced local details but potentially over-enhanced noise [7][8].

The use of a contrast metric in image quality evaluation might influence the perceived quality of the image. For example, a compression algorithm evaluated with a simple statistical metric like RMS Contrast might be deemed acceptable, but if evaluated using a perceptual metric like Weber's Contrast, the same algorithm might reveal noticeable artifacts due to the differences in how these metrics evaluate contrast [10][14].

Overall, the choice of contrast metric should align with the specific requirements and characteristics of the application. Understanding the strengths and limitations of each contrast metric can enable researchers and practitioners to select the appropriate metric and improve the outcomes of their image processing tasks [15].

6. Future Research Directions

Image contrast is a key characteristic influencing image quality and the effectiveness of many computer vision and image processing tasks. Despite the wide variety of contrast metrics currently available, there exist numerous challenges and opportunities for future research in this area.

6.1. Discussion on the Challenges in Current Contrast Metrics

Existing contrast metrics, while offering valuable insights into image quality, face several limitations. Metrics such as Global Histogram Contrast, and RMS Contrast often fall short in capturing local variations in contrast, and are sensitive to extreme values and noise [3][13][14]. On the other hand, Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC) and Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC), which are better equipped to capture local contrast variations, demand more computational resources and can be affected by parameter selection and to image degradations like blurring [5][7][9].

Another challenge lies in the gap between these metrics and the human visual perception of contrast. Weber's Contrast, although designed to mimic human visual perception, assumes a linear response which may not hold true in all conditions [13]. Future research should aim to address these challenges to develop contrast metrics that are robust, efficient, and perceptually relevant.

6.2. Suggestions for Future Research in Developing More Robust and Versatile Contrast Metrics

Future research in contrast metrics should seek to combine the advantages of existing metrics while minimizing their limitations. One promising direction could be to explore hybrid metrics that incorporate both global and local contrast measures [3]. This could potentially yield more robust and versatile contrast metrics capable of providing a comprehensive evaluation of image contrast.

Another area of exploration could be the integration of machine learning techniques. Deep learning algorithms, for example, could be trained to learn contrast features directly from image data, leading to metrics that better capture the complexity of real-world images [15].

Furthermore, because contrast is perceptual, future research should seek to produce measurements that closely correlate with human visual perception. This could involve integrating insights from vision science and psychophysics into the design of contrast metrics.

6.3. Potential Applications of Future Contrast Metrics

The development of more robust and versatile contrast metrics has the potential to advance a wide range of applications. In medical imaging, for example, improved contrast metrics could enhance the visibility of anomalies and aid in earlier and more accurate diagnoses [1][2].

In the field of remote sensing, better contrast metrics could improve the quality of satellite images and lead to more accurate earth observation data [4]. Similarly, in digital photography, enhanced contrast measures could help in developing better image enhancement algorithms and improve the quality of photographs [2][11].

Moreover, the development of perceptually relevant contrast metrics could advance areas such as virtual reality and computer graphics, where the goal is often to generate images that are as perceptually realistic as possible [15].

While tremendous progress has been achieved in the domain of contrast metrics, there remain several opportunities for future research. We may design more robust and adaptable contrast measures that better suit the demands of diverse image processing and computer vision applications by addressing present constraints and leveraging the promise of upcoming methodologies [1][2][3][15].

7. Conclusion

Image contrast, as a vital aspect of image quality, carries significant implications for image analysis and processing, as well as computer vision. Through this paper, we have presented an in-depth review of a range of contrast metrics, each offering unique advantages and facing particular limitations.

We have discussed global metrics, such as Global Histogram Contrast, RMS Contrast, Michelson's Contrast, and Weber's Contrast, and their strength in providing an overall estimate of contrast, which can be computed with relatively low computational complexity [1][2][11]. However, their inherent limitation lies in their inability to capture local contrast variations, as well as their sensitivity to noise and extreme values [3][13][14].

On the other hand, we have explored spatial frequency-based metrics, like Fourier Transform-based Contrast (FTC) and Wavelet Transform-based Contrast (WTC), which excellently capture local contrast variations. These metrics, though computationally demanding, offer more accurate and robust contrast estimates for complex images [3][7][9].

These metrics carry vast implications for fields like medical imaging, remote sensing, digital photography, and more [1][2][4]. They are essential for evaluating and improving the quality of images, and they have a substantial impact on the results of many image processing activities such as image enhancement, image quality assessment, and image compression [11][15].

However, the contrast measure used is determined by the specific requirements of the application, considering factors like computational resources, the complexity of the images, and the level of noise and other degradations present [3][14][15]. This balance underlines the need for continued research towards developing more robust and versatile contrast metrics, with an emphasis on aligning them more closely with human visual perception.

The quest for improved contrast metrics remains, with future work ideally focusing on addressing current challenges and harnessing the potential of emerging techniques like machine learning. The goal is to develop more robust and versatile contrast metrics that offer a comprehensive evaluation of image contrast and can adapt to a variety of image characteristics [1][2][3][15].

In conclusion, the journey towards the development of perfect contrast metrics continues, promising significant advancements in various fields related to image processing and computer vision. This journey will undoubtedly carry a transformative potential, shaping the future of how we perceive, understand, and utilize images [1][2][3][15].

References

[1] GONZALEZ, R. C., & WOODS, R. E. - *Digital Image Processing* - (4th ed.). Pearson. 2018

[2] HARALICK, R. M., & SHAPIRO, L. G. - *Computer and Robot Vision* - Volume I. Addison-Wesley. 1992

[3] STARK, J. A. *Adaptive image contrast enhancement using generalizations of histogram equalization*. 889-896. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 9(5). 2000

[4] ZUIDERVELD, K. - *Contrast Limited Adaptive Histogram Equalization* - In P. Heckbert (Ed.), Graphics Gems IV, pages 474-485. Academic Press. 1994

[5] PELI, E. - *Contrast in complex images* - Journal of the Optical Society of America A, 7(10), pages 2032-2040. 1990

[6] RAHMAN, Z., JOBSON, D. J., & WOODELL, G. A. - *Multiscale Retinex for color image enhancement. Image Processing* - IEEE Transactions on, 13(7), 1005–1013. 2004

[7] MATHERON, G. - *Random sets and integral geometry* - Wiley. 1975

[8] LI, C., & BOVIK, A. C. - *Three-component weighted structural similarity index* - In Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering. 2009

[9] KOVESI, P. - *Image features from phase congruency* - Videre: Journal of Computer Vision Research, 1(3), pages 1-26. 1999

[10] YEN, J. C., CHANG, F. J., & CHANG, S. - *A new criterion for automatic multilevel thresholding* - IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 4(3), pages 370-378. 1995

[11] SHAKED, D., & TASTL, I. - *Sharpness measure: Towards automatic image enhancement* - In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing. 2005

[12] Dominic ASAMOAH, Emmanuel OPPONG, Stephen OPPONG, Juliana DANSO - *Measuring the Performance of Image Contrast Enhancement Technique* - International Journal of Computer Applications. 181. 6-13. 2018, doi: 10.5120/ijca2018917899.

[13] WANG, Z., BOVIK, A. C., SHEIKH, H. R., & SIMONCELLI, E. P. - *Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity* - IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 13(4), pages 600-612. 2004

[14] OTSU, N. - *A threshold selection method from gray-level histograms* - IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, 9(1), pages 62-66. 1979

[15] PIELLA, G., & HEIJMANS, H. J. A. M. - *A new quality metric for image fusion* - In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing. 2003

Bibliography

Dominic ASAMOAH, Emmanuel OPPONG, Stephen OPPONG, Juliana DANSO - Measuring the Performance of Image Contrast Enhancement Technique - International Journal of Computer Applications. 181. 6-13. 2018, doi: 10.5120/ijca2018917899.

LI, C., & BOVIK, A. C. - Three-component weighted structural similarity index - In Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering. 2009

FATTAL, R., LISCHINSKI, D., & WERMAN, M. - Gradient domain high dynamic range compression - In ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG), Vol. 21, No. 3, ACM, pages 249-256. 2002

GONZALEZ, R. C., & WOODS, R. E. - Digital Image Processing - (4th ed.). Pearson. 2018

Ke GU, Guangtao ZHAI, Weisi LIN, Min LIU - The Analysis of Image Contrast: From Quality Assessment to Automatic Enhancement - IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 284-297, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1109/TCYB.2015.2401732.

HARALICK, R. M., & SHAPIRO, L. G. - Computer and Robot Vision - Volume I. Addison-Wesley. 1992

KOVESI, P. - Image features from phase congruency - Videre: Journal of Computer Vision Research, 1(3), pages 1-26. 1999

MARR, D., & HILDRETH, E. - Theory of Edge Detection - Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, 207(1167), pages 187–217. 1980

Detlev MARPE, Hans CYCON - Very low bit-rate video coding using wavelet-based techniques - Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, IEEE Transactions on. 9. 85 – 94, 1999, doi: 10.1109/76.744277

MATHERON, G. - Random sets and integral geometry - Wiley. 1975

OTSU, N. - A threshold selection method from gray-level histograms - IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, 9(1), pages 62-66. 1979

Omprakash PATEL, Yogendra P. S. MARAVI, Sanjeev SHARMA - A Comparative Study of Histogram Equalization Based Image Enhancement Techniques for Brightness Preservation and Contrast Enhancement - Signal & Image Processing: An International Journal (SIPIJ) Vol.4, No.5, October 2013, doi: 10.5121/sipij.2013.4502

PELI, E. - Contrast in complex images - Journal of the Optical Society of America A, 7(10), pages 2032-2040. 1990

PIELLA, G., & HEIJMANS, H. J. A. M. - A new quality metric for image fusion - In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing. 2003

REINHARD, E., STARK, M., SHIRLEY, P., & FERWERDA, J. - Photographic tone reproduction for digital images - ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG), 21(3), pages 267-276. 2002

RAHMAN, Z., JOBSON, D. J., & WOODELL, G. A. - Multiscale Retinex for color image enhancement. Image Processing - IEEE Transactions on, 13(7), 1005–1013. 2004

SAAD, M. A., BOVIK, A. C., & CHARRIER, C. - Blind image quality assessment: A natural scene statistics approach in the DCT domain - IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 21(8), pages 3339-3352. 2012

SHAKED, D., & TASTL, I. - Sharpness measure: Towards automatic image enhancement - In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing. 2005

STARK, J. A. Adaptive image contrast enhancement using generalizations of histogram equalization. 889-896. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 9(5). 2000

TUMBLIN, J., & TURK, G. - LCIS: A boundary hierarchy for detail-preserving contrast reduction - In Proceedings of the 26th annual conference on computer graphics and interactive techniques. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. pages 83-90. 1999

YEN, J. C., CHANG, F. J., & CHANG, S. - A new criterion for automatic multilevel thresholding - IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 4(3), pages 370-378. 1995

Z. LI, Yongkui LIU, Jian YUN, Feixue HUANG - A new edge detection method based on contrast enhancement - 2009 International Conference on Future BioMedical Information Engineering (FBIE), Sanya, China, 2009, pp. 164-167, doi: 10.1109/FBIE.2009.5405865.

WANG, Z., BOVIK, A. C., SHEIKH, H. R., & SIMONCELLI, E. P. - Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity - IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 13(4), pages 600-612. 2004

ZUIDERVELD, K. - Contrast Limited Adaptive Histogram Equalization - In P. Heckbert (Ed.), Graphics Gems IV, pages 474-485. Academic Press. 1994