Visual Interference: An Analytical Survey of Noise Patterns in Digital Imaging

Nisha Mannan[1], Shipra Khurana[2], Mamta Rani[3]
[1,2]Research Scholar, [3]Assitant Professor
Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering
DVIET, Kurukshetra University, Karnal
Haryana-India

Abstract:

One of the most intricate challenges in image restoration lies in the delicate art of denoising eliminating unwanted distortions while faithfully preserving the integrity of meaningful visual details. The task becomes significantly more complex in the absence of prior knowledge about the nature or behavior of the noise corrupting the image. Consequently, a deep understanding of different noise types is essential for crafting effective denoising strategies. At its core, the goal of denoising is not merely to clean the image, but to reconstruct its original features with minimal loss. The choice of technique hinges heavily on the specific kind of noise introduced during image degradation. Various linear and nonlinear filtering techniques have been developed for noise reduction in images. Images are increasingly utilized across diverse fields such as education and medicine. However, noise often gets introduced during transmission, which can affect image quality and usability.

Keywords — **Digital Image Processing, Noise Type, Probability Density Functions, Salt-and-pepper noise**

INTRODUCTION

Digital image processing, a specialized branch of digital signal processing, centers on the manipulation and analysis of images through computational techniques. Unlike analog image processing, its digital counterpart offers a significantly broader range of algorithms and tools, enabling more sophisticated and flexible operations. One notable advantage is its ability to preserve image quality while applying complex transformations. However, digital images are not immune to imperfections—noise often creeps in during transmission between devices or across networks, leading to degradation that must be carefully addressed in post-processing. This interference can distort the image quality, arising from various factors in the communication channel. Managing and minimizing such noise is a critical aspect of ensuring the integrity of the transmitted image. Image processing encompasses various techniques where images serve as both inputs and outputs. However, imperfections in the equipment involved often lead to the introduction of noise into the processed images. During the image acquisition stage, optical signals are first transformed into electrical signals and subsequently digitized. This series of conversions is a common source of noise in digital imagery.

Several factors influence the level of noise introduced during acquisition. Among the most significant are the intensity of light and the operating temperature of the image sensor. Insufficient lighting can amplify noise, while elevated sensor temperatures often exacerbate the problem, leading to degraded image quality. Addressing these issues is crucial to achieving clearer, more accurate images in digital processing.

Denoising techniques must be tailored to the specific context in which an image is used; methods effective for satellite imagery are often ill-suited for medical images due to differences in resolution, texture, and critical detail requirements. During electronic transmission, image data is vulnerable to various forms of interference that can introduce noise and degrade visual quality. Signal disruptions within the communication channel may also distort the image. Additionally, external factors—such as dust particles on scanner surfaces—can introduce artifacts that compromise the integrity of the final image.

TYPES OF NOISE

Noise refers to any undesired signal that interferes with the intended visual information, often leading to a significant decline in image fidelity. It manifests in various forms—subtle distortions like faint lines, edge blurring, object smearing, and background disruptions—all of which compromise image sharpness and interpretability. In most cases, digital images are degraded by additive noise, typically modeled using distributions such as Gaussian, uniform, or salt-and-pepper.

Gaussian noise, in particular, is a form of statistical disturbance characterized by its alignment with the normal distribution. It spreads uniformly across the image signal and is often introduced as additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN). This type of noise is defined by a probability density function resembling a symmetric bell curve, with a mean value of zero. In practical terms, this means that every pixel in the image is randomly affected, with fluctuations centered around the original intensity values—resulting in a grainy, but statistically predictable, distortion pattern.

It is also called as electronic noise because it arises within amplifier or else detectors. Gaussian noise typically arises from natural sources like thermal vibrations of atoms interacting with their surroundings, particularly during the emission of heat from objects. Poisson noise, on the other hand, emerges due to the statistical nature of electromagnetic radiation, such as X-rays, visible light, and gamma rays, where fluctuations in photon detection lead to noise in the observed signal. In medical imaging techniques that utilize X-rays and gamma rays, the photon emission from the radiation source occurs with inherent randomness in flux, resulting in signal variability during image acquisition. These high-energy photons penetrate the patient's body, and their interactions are captured by detectors. However, the limited and stochastic nature of photon arrival leads to fluctuations in the captured signal, both spatially and temporally. This variability gives rise to what is commonly referred to as quantum noise or photon (shot) noise.

This paper highlights two prominent noise models that often occur together in such imaging contexts—the Poisson-Gaussian noise model. This hybrid model emerges when the number of detected photons is insufficient to reliably distinguish signal variations from statistical fluctuations. The Poisson component arises due to the discrete and probabilistic nature of photon events, while the Gaussian component may stem from electronic readout noise in the imaging sensors. Together, these fluctuations represent a fundamental limitation in low-light or low-dose imaging scenarios, where photon scarcity directly impacts image quality and diagnostic accuracy.

Salt-and-pepper noise:

In remote sensing imagery, one of the primary origins of Gaussian and salt-and-pepper noise is the image acquisition process itself. These noise artifacts typically emerge due to sensor imperfections, transmission errors, or sudden disturbances during data capture. **Salt-and-pepper noise** is particularly disruptive, appearing as randomly scattered white (salt) and black (pepper) pixels across the image. This contrast distortion breaks the visual harmony by introducing bright specks in dark regions and dark spots in bright areas, significantly degrading the overall image quality and making feature extraction more challenging. This type of noise often arises from factors such as malfunctioning pixels, errors during analog-to-digital conversion, or bit corruption during data transmissionIn such scenarios, the analog image signal may suffer from a combination of noise types—most notably **salt-and-pepper noise** and **additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN)**—leading to substantial image degradation. This overlapping interference results in a complex noise profile that significantly distorts visual data, making accurate analysis more difficult.

One additional and particularly disruptive form of interference is **speckle noise**. Characterized by its granular, textured appearance, speckle noise is inherent in coherent imaging systems and is especially prevalent in **Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR)** and **ultrasound imaging**. It originates from the constructive and destructive interference of coherent waves reflected from multiple scatterers, which results in random variations in pixel intensity. This noise not only diminishes visual clarity but also complicates image interpretation in both remote sensing and biomedical diagnostics.

This type of noise is signal-dependent—meaning that areas of the image with higher pixel intensities experience greater noise levels. As a result, speckle noise tends to vary with the underlying signal, making it particularly challenging to filter without losing important image details. In SAR oceanography, for pattern, stain sound is cause through signal from simple scatter, the gravity-capillary ripple, plus manifest as a base picture, under the picture of the sea influence.

Uniform Noise: Quantization noise, also known as quantization error, arises from representing image pixels using a limited number of discrete levels. This results in a form of distortion with an approximately uniform distribution. In the case of uniform noise, the gray-level values are evenly spread across a defined range. Due to its predictable nature, uniform noise is often employed in simulations to mimic various noise patterns and is frequently used to test and benchmark image restoration techniques.

IV. IMAGE DE-NOISING TECNIQUES

Image denoising presents a significant challenge for researchers, as noise removal can unintentionally introduce artifacts or blur important details. Despite these risks, denoising is a crucial preprocessing step that must be performed before any meaningful image analysis can take place. Therefore, implementing an effective denoising technique is essential to accurately preserve image content while compensating for noise-related distortions. A variety of techniques have been employed to suppress noise from digital images, one of the most effective being the **PGFND method**—short for *Patch-Gaze Fuzzy Nonlinear Diffusion*. This approach integrates two powerful denoising strategies: **Patch-Gaze Fuzzy Metric (PGFM)** and **Nonlinear Diffusion Filtering (NDF)**. The PGFND algorithm operates sequentially, beginning with the application of PGFM to target and eliminate **impulsive noise**, followed by NDF to suppress **Gaussian noise**.

In this method, the gaze-driven fuzzy metric leverages visual attention modeling to enhance noise detection, allowing it to efficiently remove irregular, salt-and-pepper-like artifacts. Subsequently, the NDF process smooths out the remaining Gaussian noise without significantly blurring important image structures. This two-stage hybrid framework capitalizes on the strengths of both techniques, resulting in robust denoising performance across various noise conditions. Together, these methods work synergistically to eliminate both random and stain-like noise artifacts.

- ❖ **Non-Local mean algorithm**: This approach results in significantly improved post-filtering clarity and minimizes the loss of important image features, outperforming traditional methods like the local mean filter. When compared to other well-known denoising techniques—such as Gaussian smoothing, anisotropic diffusion, total variation denoising, and adaptive neighborhood filtering—Wavelet thresholding stands out for its ability to effectively suppress noise while maintaining intricate image details. By decomposing the image into multiple frequency components, this method allows for selective attenuation of noise without compromising the structural integrity of fine textures and edges, making it a highly reliable choice for precision-focused image restoration tasks.

- The Non-Local Means (NL-means) algorithm, introduced by Buades, further enhances denoising performance by leveraging the redundancy of similar patterns across the image into account the redundancy of information in the image.
- **Total variation Method:** The core idea behind this technique is that signals containing sharp transitions or possible noise artifacts typically display elevated total variation—characterized by a high cumulative gradient magnitude across the image, indicating abrupt intensity changes. Based on this principle, minimizing the total variation of a signal encourages it to closely resemble the original, effectively suppressing unwanted fluctuations while preserving essential features like prominent edges. This technique, known as **total variation denoising** or **total variation regularization**, is widely employed in digital image processing, particularly for reducing **impulse noise** such as salt-and-pepper artifacts. While it is highly effective in maintaining sharp, linear structures within an image, it does have a limitation: fine textures and subtle details may be smoothed out during the denoising process, leading to a slight loss of visual richness.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The morphological gradient image was analyzed, and upon applying the proposed method, it was observed that the original and processed images exhibited a 100% similarity score—indicating visual indistinguishability between the two. This confirms that the denoising technique preserves critical image structures with exceptional fidelity. For comparative evaluation, outputs from various denoising algorithms were generated and visually inspected. Among these, pixel-based processing emerged as a notably efficient and intuitive method, often yielding superior accuracy in enhancing image quality when compared to more complex enhancement techniques. The statistical measurements are also calculated with entropy, peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR) and mean square error (MSE). A distinct variation emerges when comparing the two images—one sourced directly from the system and the other acquired via digital media and subsequently downloaded. The system-based image displays consistently aligned pixels, reflecting its intact structure and clarity. In contrast, the image retrieved from digital media reveals noticeable pixel misalignment, likely introduced during compression, transmission, or format conversion processes. This discrepancy highlights the impact of different acquisition methods on image quality and structural integrity.

NEUTROSOPHIC APPROACH

To suppress Rician noise in MRI scans, a median filter based on the Neutrosophic Set framework is employed, enhancing image clarity and reliability. This filtering technique delivers high-quality denoised results, excelling in both visual clarity and objective metrics like PSNR, SSIM, and QILV. It outperforms traditional median and Non-Local Means (NLM) filters, especially under high noise conditions such as low SNR. By iteratively adjusting pixel intensities based on neighboring values, it effectively preserves edges while reducing Rician noise. The method functions as a nonlinear, edge-preserving, noise-suppressing filter that replaces each pixel with a weighted average of its local neighborhood.

CONCLUSION

This paper presents a digital image matching method based on mathematical morphology, emphasizing object rigidity for accurate matching. It concludes that many denoising techniques are tailored to specific noise types—performing well in those cases but poorly with others. Therefore, understanding noise models is crucial in image processing, as effective denoising depends on identifying the noise type and selecting filters accordingly. The choice of filter is guided by the noise characteristics at each pixel and the filter's behavior over the image region.

REFERENCES

1. Bhattacharya J. K., Chakraborty D., & Samanta H. S., (2005) “Brownian Motion - Past and Present,” Cornall university library. arXiv:cond-mat/0511389.
2. Hosseini H. & Marvasti F., (2013) “Fast restoration of natural images corrupted by high-density impulse noise,” EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing. doi:10.1186/1687-5281-2013-15.
3. Koli M. & Balaji S., (2013) “Literature survey on impulse noise reduction,” Signal & Image Processing : An International Journal (SIPIJ) Vol.4, No.5.
4. Zhang L., Dong W., Zhang D. & Shi G. (2010) “Two stage denoising by principal component analysis with local pixel grouping,” Elsevier Pattern Recognition, Vol. 43, Issue 4, pp. 1531-1549.
5. T. Chhabra, G. Dua and T. Malhotra (2013) “Comparative Analysis of Denoising Methods in CT Images” International Journal of Emerging Trends in Electrical and Electronics, Vol. 3, Issue 2.
6. Alka Pandey, Dr. K.K.Singh, Analysis Of Noise Models In Digital Image Processing, International Journal of Science, Technology &

Management, Volume No 04, Special Issue No. 01, May 2015.

7. Ajay Kumar Boyat and Brijendra Kumar Joshi, A Review Paper: Noise Models In Digital Image Processing, Signal & Image Processing : An International Journal (SIPIJ) Vol.6, No.2, April 2015.
8. Pawan Patidar, Sumit Srivastava, Image De-noising by Various Filters for Different Noise, International Journal of Computer Applications (0975 – 8887) Volume 9– No.4, November 2010.
9. Inderpreet Singh, Nirvair Neeru, Performance Comparison of Various Image Denoising Filters Under Spatial Domain, International Journal of Computer Applications (0975 – 8887) Volume 96-No.19, June 2014.
10. Rohit verma and Jahid ali, ―A comparative study of various types of image noise and efficient noise removal techniques, International journal of advanced research in computer science and software engineering, volume 3, issue 10 October 2013.
11. A. K. Jain, "Fundamentals of Digital ImageProcessing", Prentice Hall of India, First Edition, 1989.
12. Mr. Mandar D. Sontakke, Dr. Mrs. Meghana S. Kulkarni, Different Types Of Noises In Images And Noise Removing Technique, International Journal of Advanced Technology in Engineering and Science. Volume No.03, Issue No. 01, January 2015.
13. Jyotsna Patil, and Sunita Jadhav," A Comparative Study Of Image Denoising Techniques", vol. 2, pp. 787-794, issue 3, March 2013.
14. Priyanka Kamboj et al.," Brief study of various noise model and filtering techniques", vol.4, No.4, pp.166-171, April 2013.