

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1.1: | Comparison of various landmark detection algorithms. | 39 |
| Table 2.1: | Transforms used in two profiles. | 51 |
| Table 3.1: | Computation time of different methods in seconds (sec). | 81 |
| Table 3.2: | PSNR of the noisy image and images restored by each method in combination with VST. | 81 |
| Table 3.3: | Average MSSIM computed for output of each method in combination with VST with respect to the ground truth noise free image. | 82 |
| Table 3.4: | Computed Pratt's FOM for enhanced image. | 82 |
| Table 4.1: | EME values for the input images and the images enhanced by different Methods. | 94 |
| Table 4.2: | AMBE values for the images enhanced by different methods. | 94 |
| Table 4.3: | H values for the input images and the images enhanced by different Methods. | 95 |
| Table 4.4: | TEN values for the input images and the images enhanced by different methods. | 95 |
| Table 4.5: | MSSIM values for the images enhanced by different methods. | 96 |
| Table 5.1: | Computation time of the algorithms in milliseconds (msec). | 106 |
| Table 5.2: | Subpixel locations corresponding to the proposed algorithm, Ghosal's method and Bin's method. | 111 |
| Table 5.3: | Table shows time complexity of the various algorithms in (msec). | 111 |
| Table 6.1: | List of Reference Landmarks and their description. | 119 |
| Table 6.2: | Comparison of success rate of landmark detection with previous methods (when reported). | 122 |
| Table 6.3: | Comparison of recognition results in terms of mean location | 123 |

error (ME) and standard deviation (SD) in millimeter (mm) when reported.

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 7.1: | Accuracy of landmarks in percentage. | 136 |
| Table 7.2: | ME and SD for each landmark in x and y direction in mm. | 137 |
| Table 7.3: | Comparison of recognition results in terms of ME and SD in mm when reported. | 137 |
| Table 8.1: | ME (pixels) for the 18 landmarks in x direction. | 145 |
| Table 8.2: | ME (pixels) for the 18 landmarks in y direction. | 145 |
| Table 8.3: | This Table gives the time complexity of traditional ART and ART (4-way symmetry) and traditional PCET for an image of size 256×256 . | 147 |
| Table 8.4: | Values of $\cos(m\theta)$ at eight symmetric/anti-symmetric locations P_1 through P_8 . | 150 |
| Table 8.5: | Values of $\sin(m\theta)$ at eight symmetric/anti-symmetric locations P_1 through P_8 . | 151 |
| Table 8.6: | Clustering of image pixels of 8-radially symmetrical locations. | 152 |
| Table 8.7: | CPU elapse time (sec) for the computation of PCET for Algorithm A, Algorithm B, and Algorithm C for image resolution 256×256 pixels and for various order and repetition of transforms from $n_{max} = m_{max} = 2$ through $n_{max} = m_{max} = 24$. | 155 |
| Table 8.8: | Comparison of computation of ART (fast method) and PCET (proposed). | 155 |
| Table 9.1: | ME for 18 landmarks obtained using two proposed algorithm. | 159 |
| Table 9.2: | SD for 18 landmarks obtained using two proposed algorithm. | 160 |