

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Digital lateral cephalogram.	30
Figure 1.2:	Tracing with some hard and soft tissue landmarks.	30
Figure 2.1:	An image showing subpixel location of an edge.	60
Figure 2.2:	(a) Inner circle mapping, and (b) Outer circle mapping.	63
Figure 2.3:	Ideal step edge.	65
Figure 2.4:	(a) CPs along lines with different angles and (b) RPs along different circles.	72
Figure 3.1:	(a) Original digital test image, (b) Image after addition of Poisson's noise. Results after applying (c) VST+PM (d) VST+HDCS (e) BM3D(NP) and (f) BM3D(LC).	79
Figure 3.2:	(a) Original scanned test image (b) Image after addition of Poisson's noise. Results after applying (c) VST+PM (d) VST+HDCS (e) BM3D(NP) and (f) BM3D(LC).	80
Figure 4.1:	(a) Input low contrast digital cephalogram image. Enhancement results (b) GHE (c) CLAHE (d) GLG (e) HMF (f) GLIH and (g) Proposed algorithm.	91
Figure 4.2:	(a) Input low contrast scanned cephalogram image. Enhancement results (b) GHE (c) CLAHE (d) GLG (e) HMF (f) GLIH and (g) Proposed algorithm.	92
Figure 4.3:	(a) Input low contrast Lena image. Enhancement results (b) GHE (c) CLAHE (d) GLG (e) HMF (f) GLIH and (g) Proposed algorithm.	93
Figure 5.1:	The centre circle corresponds to the pixel p_{ij} whose fuzzy value has to be calculated and the eight surrounding black dots are its eight neighbors (N_{xy}), which are used in the calculation of variance.	99
Figure 5.2:	(a) Structuring element and (b) 90° rotated version of (a).	101
Figure 5.3:	Test image (a) Peppers and (b) Cephalogram.	102

Figure 5.4:	This figure gives the edge results corresponding to test image pepper, (a) Tizhoosh's method I (b) Tizhoosh's method II (c) Tizhoosh's method III (d) Jinbo's algorithm (e) Liang's fuzzy edge detector (f) Russo's method (g) Canny edge detector (h) Susan edge detector and (i) Proposed algorithm.	103
Figure 5.5:	This figure gives the edge results corresponding to cephalogram test image (a) Tizhoosh's method I (b) Tizhoosh's method II (c) Tizhoosh's method III (d) Jinbo's algorithm (e) Liang's fuzzy edge detector (f) Russo's method (g) Canny edge detector (h) Susan edge detector and (i) Proposed algorithm.	104
Figure 5.6:	(a) Test image shapes. Results obtained by (b) Canny edge detector (c) Susan edge detector and (d) Proposed algorithm.	105
Figure 5.7:	Pseudo-Zernike moment masks (a) PZ_{00} (b) PZ_{11R} (c) PZ_{11I} (d) PZ_{10} and (e) PZ_{20} .	108
Figure 5.8:	Two test images used for testing the proposed algorithm (a) and (b). The results for Ghosal and Mehrotra's method are given in (c) and (d), Bin's method is given in (e) and (f), and proposed algorithm in (g) and (h).	110
Figure 5.9:	The edge results for the three algorithms for noisy images containing Gaussian noise.	111
Figure 6.1:	Figure 6.1: (a) Four reference landmarks used in [26] (b) Five reference landmarks detected using Canny edge detector in [17] (c) Three reference landmarks detected using Susan edge detector in [27].	114
Figure 6.2:	Cephalograms with the landmark position markings.	118
Figure 6.3:	Results for three landmarks (<i>Sor</i> , <i>Cd</i> and <i>Prn</i>) after applying different steps of the proposed algorithm on a test	121

image (a) Stage I (Step 2) Landmarks positions corresponding to best matching five images (b) Stage I (Step 3) Landmark position after alignment (c) The four expectation windows around the mean (d) Blue star gives initial approximation and red star gives the position found using projection based template matching and (e) Blue star initial landmark position for stage three and yellow star gives the final position found using the combination of NCC and SSD.

Figure 6.4:	Mean location error (ME) in millimeters (mm) for template matching using SSD and NCC.	125
Figure 6.5:	Standard deviation (SD) of location error in case of SSD and NCC.	125
Figure 7.1:	(a) Region around landmark Me and Pog with illumination effects (b) Low contrast and noisy region near landmark Prn (c) Result of applying DoG to Pog region (d) Result of applying DoG to Prn region.	131
Figure 7.2:	ME (pixels) in x direction for the two proposed algorithms for 18 landmarks.	135
Figure 7.3:	ME (pixels) in y direction for the two proposed algorithms for 18 landmarks.	135
Figure 7.4:	Assessment of accuracy of six landmarks common in all the studies.	136
Figure 7.5:	Comparison of variability (mm) of proposed algorithm with variability of manually marked landmarks.	138
Figure 7.6:	Cropped images of landmark <i>Uie</i> .	139
Figure 8.1:	Features extracted from <i>Uie</i> , <i>Me</i> , <i>Na</i> , <i>Go</i> and <i>Prn</i> .	142
Figure 8.2:	ME (pixels) in x direction for the five methods for 18 landmarks.	146
Figure 8.3:	ME (pixels) in y direction for the five methods for 18	146

	landmarks.	
Figure 8.4:	ME (pixels) for the five methods in pixels.	147
Figure 8.5:	8-way symmetry of a pixel $P_1(i, k)$ with $x_i = (2i + 1)/N$, $y_k = (2k + 1)/N$. The origin of the coordinate system is at the centre of the image.	149
Figure 8.6:	CPU elapse time (sec) for the computation of PCETs for image resolution 256×256 pixels and various orders and repetitions of transforms from $p_{max} = q_{max} = 2$ through $p_{max} = q_{max} = 24$, (a) Comparison among Algorithm A, B, and C, and (b) Comparison between Algorithm B, and C.	153
Figure 8.7:	CPU elapse time (sec) for the computation of PCETs for fixed order and repetition $p_{max} = q_{max} = 24$ and various resolutions from 64×64 pixels through 512×512 pixels (a) Comparison among algorithm A, B, and C, and (b) Comparison between algorithm B, and C.	154
Figure A.1:	Shows some scanned cephalograms from Hutton's database.	175
Figure A.2:	Sample digital images from the self created database.	176
Figure A.3:	Subimages showing the various landmark locations.	178