

---

Subject: Re: Image error calculation

Posted by [Brian Daniel](#) on Thu, 01 Apr 2010 16:22:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Image quality is a current field of research. Check out SPIE or OSA journals if you're really interested in more detailed metrics. If you're not, I suggest taking the root mean squared error between your images. IDL's element by element algebra is very handy for this.

Best,  
Brian

On Apr 1, 3:42 am, Maxwell Peck <maxjp...@gmail.com> wrote:

> I have a feeling there is probably a 'proper' way to do this but  
> perhaps you could use something like Sobel edge detection filter  
> ([http://idlastro.gsfc.nasa.gov/idl\\_html\\_help/SOBEL.html](http://idlastro.gsfc.nasa.gov/idl_html_help/SOBEL.html)) which  
> calculates the magnitude of the gradients in the image. Sharper lines  
> I would think have a larger gradients than blurred areas so perhaps a  
> difference between the Sobel detected 'improved' image and the Sobel  
> detected original image may give some indication? I'm not sure if  
> you'd have to average the result somehow because of the blurring  
> itself though...

>  
> Max

>  
> On Apr 1, 2:07 pm, Suguru Amakubo <sfa2...@googlemail.com> wrote:

>  
>  
>  
>> Sorry about that, what I will consider to be a better quality image is  
>> that the details of the structures (DNA) could be identified better.

>  
>> So in a nutshell if I see the new image and see more details that was  
>> previously unidentifiable (due to partial blurring) that I consider to  
>> be a better image. A 'sharper' image will probably best describe it.  
>> However the problem lies in quantifying it. (Since saying this image  
>> looks better just won't do. It needs to be: e.g. x % better than the  
>> original image).

>  
>> As for the how I made the image, I basically used one image as a  
>> 'base' and the took 22 different images of the same DNA that was taken  
>> immediately after each other and then split the new image into smaller  
>> subset images and mathematically found a point that is considered to  
>> be similar and placed it on top of it (then divided to get the end  
>> image).

>  
>> My aim therefore is to compare the base image with the new image and

>> determine quantitatively by what degree the image has improved.  
>  
>> Sorry about the lack of explanation. Please tell me if the above needs  
>> explaining further.  
>  
>> Suguru

---