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#### Abstract

In this paper we present a new method of reconstructing an image that undergoes a spatially invariant blurring process and is corrupted by noise. The methodology is based on a theory of multidimensional moment problems with rationality constraints. This can be seen as generalized spectral estimation with a finiteness condition, which in turn can be considered a problem in system identification. With noise it becomes an ill-posed deconvolution problem and needs regularization. A Newton solver is developed, and the algorithm is tested on two images under different boundary conditions. These preliminary results show that the proposed method could be a viable alternative to regularized least squares for image deblurring, although more work is needed to perfect the method.
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## 1 Introduction

Image deblurring is a deconvolution problem in two dimensions. It is well noted that the problem of deconvolution is ill-posed [1-3], and hence regularization is crucial. The deblurring problem is often formulated as a regularized least squares problem, such as Tikhonov regularization, which has a closed form solution. Other regularization methods include those exploiting partial derivatives [4], total-variation deblurring [5, 6], or penalized maximum likelihood [7].

Blurring a two-dimensional image $\Phi(x), x \in K \subset \mathbb{R}^{2}$, can be modeled as a convolution integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
b(x)=\int_{K} \kappa(x-y) \Phi(y) d y \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\kappa$ is a kernel function, called the point spread function (PSF). Deblurring amounts to the deconvolution of (1), i.e., to recover the original image $\Phi$ from the blurred image $b$.

If the blurred image is observed in discrete points $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ like pixels, then (1) becomes a generalized two-dimensional moment problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}=\int_{K} \alpha_{k}(x) \Phi(x) d x, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, n \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{k}:=b\left(x_{k}\right)$ and $\alpha_{k}(x):=\kappa\left(x_{k}-x\right), k=1,2, \ldots, n$. Here $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}$ are called basis functions. Reconstruct$\operatorname{ing} \Phi$ from $c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{n}$ is an inverse problem, which may or may not have a solution. If it does, it will in general have infinitely many. To achieve compression of data, we impose the rationality constraint

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(x)=\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P$ and $Q$ are nonnegative functions formed by linear combinations of the basis functions. This can be seen as a (generalized) two-dimensional spectral estimation problem with a finiteness condition, and hence as a two-dimensional identification problem [8]. (In fact, general basis functions, rather than trigonometric ones, are also used in system identification [9].) If (2) does not have a solution, which is the
usual case, a regularized approximate solution need to be determined.

The one-dimensional moment problem with rationality constraint has been studied intensively during the last decades. It originated with the rational covariance extension problem, first formulated in [10]. In the present context this problem can be reformulated as follows. Given a sequence of covariance lags $c_{0}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{n}$ with a positive definite Toeplitz matrix, parameterize the family of all functions (3) defined on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ in the complex plane and satisfying the moment condition (2), where $P$ and $Q$ are symmetric trigonometric polynomials of degree at most $n$. The first result on this problem can be found in [11], where it was shown that there exists a solution for each choice of zeros of $P$, and it was conjectured that the assignment is unique. This conjecture was proved in [12], where it was shown the the complete parameterization is smooth, and hence solution can be tuned continuously. In $[13,14]$ it was shown that each solution is the unique solution of a pair of dual convex optimization problems. This leads to a long list of results with more general basis functions, among them [15-32].

More recently, these results were generalized to the multidimensional case [33] with applications to spectral estimation and image compression [34]. Related results can be found in [35]. It turns out that the early papers [36-38] contain results that are equivalent to some major results in [33, 34], but the basic idea of smooth parameterization is missing there.

In this paper, we apply the method of the moment problem with rationality constraint to image deblurring with the help of regularization. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the main result of the theory of multidimensional moment problem and in Section 3 regularized approximate solutions are determined for the case that the estimated moments contain errors. We consider the optimization problem for image deblurring in the framework of multidimensional moment problem in Section 4, and a Newton solver is developed. Finally, some implementation details of the proposed method are given in Section 5 along with two reconstructed images. These results are prelimi-
nary, and better methods to tune the solutions will be developed in future work.

## 2 The multidimensional moment problem

We start by reviewing some results in [33]. Let $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$be the positive cone of vectors $p:=\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{n}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{n} p_{k} \alpha_{k}(x)>0 \quad \text { for all } x \in K \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and let $\overline{\mathfrak{P}}_{+}$be the closure of $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$and $\partial \mathfrak{P}_{+}:=\overline{\mathfrak{P}}_{+} \backslash \mathfrak{P}_{+}$its boundary. Then, given a set of real numbers $c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{n}$, and linearly independent functions $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}$ defined on a compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, consider the problem to find solutions $\Phi$ to the moment condition (2) of the rational form (3), where $p, q \in \mathfrak{P}_{+}$. Here of course $q$ is the vector of coefficients of $Q$. Next define the open dual cone $\mathfrak{C}_{+}$of vectors $c:=\left(c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{n}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{C}_{+}=\left\{c \mid\langle c, p\rangle=\sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{k} p_{k}>0, \quad \forall p \in \overline{\mathfrak{P}}_{+} \backslash\{0\}\right\} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the cone $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$is nonempty and has the property

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{K} \frac{1}{Q} d x=\infty \text { for all } q \in \partial \mathfrak{P}_{+} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

it follows from [33, Corollary 3.5] that the moment equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}=\int_{K} \alpha_{k} \frac{P}{Q} d x, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, n \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

have a unique solution $q \in \mathfrak{P}_{+}$for each $(c, p) \in \mathfrak{C}_{+} \times \mathfrak{P}_{+}$. Moreover, the solution can be obtained by minimizing the strictly convex functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{J}_{p}^{c}(q)=\langle c, q\rangle-\int_{K} P \log Q d x \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

over all $q \in \mathfrak{P}_{+}$. This is the dual of the optimization problem to maximize an entropy-like functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{I}_{p}(\Phi)=\int_{K} P(x) \log \Phi(x) d x \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

over all $\Phi \in \mathfrak{F}_{+}$satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{K} \alpha_{k}(x) \Phi(x) d x=c_{k}, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, n \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathfrak{F}_{+}$is the class of positive functions in $L_{1}(K)$.
We note that maximizing (9) is equivalent to minimizing the Kullback-Leibler pseudo-distance given $P$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{D}(P \| \Phi)=\int_{K} P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{\Phi(x)} d x \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{D}(P \| \Phi)=\int_{K} P(x) \log P(x) d x-\mathbb{I}_{p}(\Phi) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From [33, Theorem 3.4] we have that the map sending $q \in \mathfrak{P}_{+}$to $c \in \mathfrak{C}_{+}$is a diffeomorphism, so the problem as stated above is well-posed.

## 3 Regularized approximation

In practice, the moments are often estimated from a finite number of data, for example, the ergodic estimates for the covariance lags, and they may not belong to the dual cone $\mathfrak{C}_{+}$, and then no solution exists. The problem may be illposed also for other reasons. When the data sequence is short, the estimates may contain large errors. Therefore, it is reasonable to match the estimated moments only approximately by allowing an error $d:=\left(d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{n}\right)$ in the moment equations so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}-\int_{K} \alpha_{k} \Phi d x=d_{k}, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, n \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the problem is modified to minimize

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\|d\|^{2}+\lambda \mathbb{D}(P \| \Phi) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

subject to (13) for some suitable $\lambda>0$. Here $\lambda \mathbb{D}(P \| \Phi)$ is a regularization term which makes the solution smooth. In view of (12), this problem can be reformulated as the problem to maximize

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{I}(\Phi, d)=\int_{K} P(x) \log \Phi(x) d x-\frac{1}{2 \lambda}\|d\|^{2} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

subject to (13) over all $\Phi$ and $d$. Regularization problems of this type have been considered in [39, 40]. Also see [41], where similar results are given.

We assume the condition (6) holds. Modifying the idea of [39, 40] to the setting of [33], we form the Lagrangian

$$
\begin{array}{r}
L(\Phi, d, q)=\mathbb{I}(\Phi, d)+\sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{k}\left(c_{k}-\int_{K} \alpha_{k} \Phi d x-d_{k}\right) \\
\quad=\int_{K} P \log \Phi d x-\int_{K} Q \Phi d x-\frac{1}{2 \lambda} d^{\top} d+\langle c-d, q\rangle \tag{16}
\end{array}
$$

with the directional derivative
$\delta L(\Phi, d, q ; \delta \Phi, \delta d)=\int_{K}\left(\frac{P}{\Phi}-Q\right) \delta \Phi d x-\left(\lambda^{-1} d+q\right)^{\top} \delta d$.
For stationarity we require that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi=\frac{P}{Q} \quad \text { and } \quad d=-\lambda q \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

which inserted into $L(\Phi, d, q)$ yields the dual functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(q)=\mathbb{J}_{p}(q)+\int_{K} P(\log P-1) d x \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the last term is constant and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\frac{\lambda}{2}\langle q, q\rangle+\langle c, q\rangle-\int_{K} P \log Q d x \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Setting the gradient of $\mathbb{J}_{p}$ equal to zero, we obtain the moment equations with errors

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{K} \alpha_{k} \frac{P}{Q} d x=c_{k}+\lambda q_{k}, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, n \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

The regularization parameter $\lambda$ controls how much error/noise is allowed in the solution. By choosing $\lambda$ small, the error in the moment equation becomes small. In practice, however, it may be difficult for the algorithm to converge if $\lambda$ is chosen too small.

We need to show that (21) actually has a solution, which would follow if (20) would have an interior minimum. It is easy to see that (20) is strictly convex.

Lemma 1. The functional (20) has compact sublevel sets $\mathbb{J}_{p}^{-1}(-\infty, r], r \in \mathbb{R}$.
Proof. The sublevel set $\mathbb{J}_{p}^{-1}(-\infty, r]$ is closed, so it remains to prove that it is bounded, i.e., $\alpha=\|Q\|_{\infty}$ is bounded. Set $Q=\alpha \tilde{Q}$, where $\tilde{Q}(x) \leq 1$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\frac{\lambda}{2}\langle\tilde{q}, \tilde{q}\rangle \alpha^{2}+\langle c, \tilde{q}\rangle \alpha-\int_{K} P d x \log \alpha \\
& \quad-\int_{K} P \log \tilde{Q} d x \geq a_{0} \alpha^{2}+a_{1} \alpha-a_{2} \log \alpha,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_{0}:=\lambda\langle\tilde{q}, \tilde{q}\rangle / 2>0, a_{1}:=\langle c, \tilde{q}\rangle$ and $a_{2}:=$ $\int_{K} P d x>0$. Hence, if $q \in \mathbb{J}_{p}^{-1}(-\infty, r]$,

$$
a_{0} \alpha^{2}+a_{1} \alpha-a_{2} \log \alpha \leq r .
$$

Comparing quadratic and logarithmic growth we see that $\alpha$ is bounded from above. Since $\log \alpha \rightarrow-\infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, it is also bounded away from zero.

Consequently, by strict convexity, (20) has a unique minimum. We have to rule out that this minimum is on the boundary of $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$. In other words, we need to establish that the minimal point is an interior point so that it satisfies the stationary condition (21).

Lemma 2. The minimum point of $\mathbb{J}_{p}$ does not lie on the boundary.
Proof. We proceed along the lines of [13, p.662]. Let $q \in$ $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$be arbitrary, and let $q_{0}$ be on the boundary. Set $\delta q=$ $q-q_{0}$ and define $q_{\mu}=q_{0}+\mu \delta q$. Since $q_{\mu}=\mu q+(1-\mu) q_{0}$ and $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$is convex, it belongs to $\mathfrak{P}_{+}$for all $\mu \in(0,1]$. Next, calculate the directional derivative

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \delta \mathbb{J}_{p}\left(q_{\mu}, \delta q\right)=\lambda\left\langle q_{\mu}, \delta q\right\rangle+\langle c, \delta q\rangle-\int_{K} \frac{P}{Q_{\mu}} \delta Q d x \\
= & \left\langle c+\lambda q_{\mu}, \delta q\right\rangle-\int_{K} R_{\mu} d x, \text { where } R_{\mu}:=\frac{P}{Q_{\mu}} \delta Q .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$
\frac{d R_{\mu}}{d \mu}=-P \frac{\left(Q-Q_{0}\right)^{2}}{Q_{\mu}^{2}} \leq 0
$$

$R_{\mu}$ is monotonically decreasing and converges to $R_{0}=$ $P\left(Q-Q_{0}\right) / Q_{0}$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$. However, by condition (6), $R_{0}$ is not integrable, and hence $\delta \mathbb{J}\left(q_{\mu}, \delta q\right) \rightarrow-\infty$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$.

## 4 Application to image deblurring

We now return to the convolution equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
b(x)=\int_{K} \kappa(x-y) \Phi(y) d y \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

introduced in Section 1, where $\kappa$ is the point spread function (PSF), $\Phi$ is original image and $b$ is the blurred image. Then
setting $c_{k}:=b\left(x_{k}\right)$ and $\alpha_{k}(x):=\kappa\left(x_{k}-x\right)$, we obtain the moment equations (2). We want to recover the object $\Phi$ from the blurred image $b$ given the PSF $\kappa$.

After discretization, the blurring process is described by a linear transform plus some additive noise, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{b}=A \mathbf{x}+\eta \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we have introduced the bold lower-case letters $\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ to denote the vectorized discretization of the bivariate functions $b(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$, respectively. The blurring matrix $A$ is determined by the PSF and the boundary condition depending on our assumptions of how the picture would be continued outside the image $[4,42,43]$.

As pointed out in [1], the continuous inverse problem (22) is ill-posed. Although the problem may become well-posed after discretization, the blurring matrix $A$ is typically illconditioned. Due to the presence of the noise term $\eta$, the directly inverted solution is unacceptable from the physical point of view. Therefore, regularization must be introduced in order to produce a visually meaningful solution.

Noted that each row of the blurring matrix $A$ is the discrete analogue to the basis function $\alpha_{k}$ in the formulation of the moment problem. As already mentioned, $A$ is nonsingular although rather close to being singular, and hence its rows are linearly independent. Therefore, linear combination of the basis functions becomes matrix-vector multiplication

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{q}:=\operatorname{vec}(Q)=A^{\top} q, \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the matrix $Q$ here is the discretization of the function $Q(x)$, and 'vec' denotes the vectorizing operation for the matrix. Due to the fact that the blurring matrix $A$ is highly structured [4][5], evaluation of the multiplication can be obtained efficiently with 2-dimensional fast Fourier transform (FFT) or discrete cosine transform (DCT), depending on the boundary condition.

### 4.1 The optimization problem

Using the vectorized notation as in (23) and (24), the discretized objective functional corresponding to (8) can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\mathbf{b}^{\top} q-\mathbf{p}^{\top} \log \left(A^{\top} q\right) \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{p}$ here is the discretized prior function $P$. The vectorvalued $\log$ function denotes taking logarithm for each entry of the vector. The reconstructed image

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{p} \cdot /\left(A^{\top} q^{*}\right), \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $q^{*}$ is the optimal solution that minimizes (25) and the operation './' means element-wise division.

Consider the vector-valued log function first. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
\left(\log A^{\top} x\right)_{i}=\log \left(a_{i}^{\top} x\right)
$$

where $a_{i}$ is the $i$ 'th column of $A$. The elements of the first order derivative (Jacobian) of $\log A^{\top} x$ are given by

$$
\left[\frac{d \log \left(A^{\top} x\right)}{d x}\right]_{j i}=\frac{\partial \log \left(a_{j}^{\top} x\right)}{\partial x_{i}}=\frac{a_{i j}}{a_{j}^{\top} x},
$$

that is, the $j$ 'th row of the Jacobian matrix is $a_{j}^{\top} /\left(a_{j}^{\top} x\right)$, so we have

$$
\frac{d \log \left(A^{\top} x\right)}{d x}=D_{1}(x) A^{\top}
$$

where $D_{1}(x):=\operatorname{diag}\left(1 / a_{j}^{\top} x\right)$. Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{d}{d \tau} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q+\tau v)\right|_{\tau=0} & =\mathbf{b}^{\top} v-\mathbf{p}^{\top} D_{1}(q) A^{\top} v \\
& =\left\langle\mathbf{b}-A D_{1}(q) \mathbf{p}, v\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore the gradient of $\mathbb{J}_{p}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\mathbf{b}-A D_{1}(q) \mathbf{p} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, for the computation of the Hessian, we form the following

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \tau \partial \xi} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q+\tau v+\xi w)\right|_{\tau, \xi=0} & =\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}\left[\mathbf{b}^{\top} v-\mathbf{p}^{\top} D_{1}(y) A^{\top} v\right] \\
& =\mathbf{p}^{\top} \operatorname{diag}\left[\frac{a_{j}^{\top} w}{\left(a_{j}^{\top} q\right)^{2}}\right] A^{\top} v,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $y=q+\tau v+\xi w$. We can rewrite

$$
\mathbf{p}^{\top} \operatorname{diag}\left[\frac{a_{j}^{\top} w}{\left(a_{j}^{\top} q\right)^{2}}\right]=w^{\top} A D_{2}(\mathbf{p}, q)
$$

in the last term, where $D_{2}(\mathbf{p}, q):=\operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{p}_{j} /\left(a_{j}^{\top} q\right)^{2}\right)$. We then have

$$
\left.\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \tau \partial \xi} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q+\tau v+\xi w)\right|_{\tau, \xi=0}=w^{\top} A D_{2}(\mathbf{p}, q) A^{\top} v
$$

Therefore, the formula for Hessian is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla^{2} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=A D_{2}(\mathbf{p}, q) A^{\top} . \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 4.2 Choice of the prior $P$

Recall that the primal problem to maximize (9) subject to (10) is equivalent to minimizing the Kullback-Leibler divergence (11) subject to the same moment equations. Although the Kullback-Leibler divergence is not a metric, it can be used as a pseudo-distance. In $\mathbb{D}(P, \Phi)$ the function $P$ could be regarded as a prior, and we want the $\Phi$ to be "as close as possible" to $P$ in this sense. The choice of $P$ considerably affects the quality of the solution. Choosing $P \equiv 1$ corresponds to no prior information, and the solution is referred to as the maximum entropy solution [8]. It is also demonstrated in the literature that the maximum entropy solution is often unsatisfactory. In the setting of image deblurring, the blurred image itself should serve as better prior information.

## 5 Numerical examples

For the image deblurring problem in the presence of noise we solve the regularized optimization problem to minimize

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{\mathbf{q}>0} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\mathbf{b}^{\top} q-\mathbf{p}^{\top} \log \left(A^{\top} q\right)+\frac{\lambda}{2}\|q\|^{2} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

The gradient (27) and Hessian (28) are modified a bit as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=\mathbf{b}-A D_{1}(q) \mathbf{p}+\lambda q \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla^{2} \mathbb{J}_{p}(q)=A D_{2}(\mathbf{p}, q) A^{\top}+\lambda I \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Newton's method [44] is used to solve the optimization problem (29).

Two images are chosen for the numerical test. One is the famous Lena with a resolution $256 \times 256$ and the other shows a part of the moon surface with a resolution $512 \times 512$. The blur type on the test images is out-of-focus and the PSF array is given below with radius $r=15$ :

$$
\kappa_{i j}= \begin{cases}1 /\left(\pi r^{2}\right) & \text { if }(i-k)^{2}+(j-l)^{2} \leq r^{2}  \tag{32}\\ 0 & \text { elsewhere }\end{cases}
$$

where $(k, l)$ is the center of the PSF array. Moreover, a periodic boundary condition is assumed for the Lena image, while a reflexive boundary condition is chosen for the reconstruction of the moon image. The intensity of the noise is characterized by the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), which is set as 40 dB in the test.

The central part of Newton's method is to solve the linear system of equations

$$
\nabla^{2} \mathbb{J}_{p} \Delta q=\nabla \mathbb{J}_{p}
$$

for the Newton direction $\Delta q$, and we use the conjugate gradient (CG) method [45, 46] to solve it iteratively. In each CG iteration, multiplication with the Hessian is evaluated with 4 two-dimensional FFTs/inverse FFTs (or DCTs), which makes this linear solver the major computational cost of the algorithm. To enforce the positivity constraint on $\mathbf{q}=\operatorname{vec}(Q)$ we restrict the step length $\tau$ of the line search in the Newton direction. In fact, we have in the Newton iteration

$$
q_{+}=q-\tau \Delta q
$$

and therefore

$$
\mathbf{q}_{+}=A^{\top} q_{+}=A^{\top} q-\tau A^{\top} \Delta q=\mathbf{q}-\tau \Delta \mathbf{q}
$$

where $\Delta \mathbf{q}:=A^{\top} \Delta q$. The maximum step length is taken as

$$
\tau_{\max }=\min \left\{\mathbf{q}_{i} / \Delta \mathbf{q}_{i} \mid \Delta \mathbf{q}_{i}>0\right\}
$$

With the constraint $0<\tau<\tau_{\text {max }}$, various line search methods can be used.

The original image and the corresponding blurred one is depicted in Fig. 1 for the Lena image and in Fig. 3 for the moon image. The reconstructed images are shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 4, respectively. For comparison we also compute the classical Tikhonov reconstruction, where the regularization parameter is chosen with generalized cross-validation (GCV).

In Fig. 2 we see that choosing the blurred image b as the prior indeed improves the reconstruction. Moreover, the solution of the regularized moment problem looks smoother compared with Tikhonov reconstruction without losing many details. In fact, some reconstruction artifacts are less pronounced. This can also be observed from Fig. 4. However, some work remains to perfect this method.

## 6 Open problems and future research

A question worth investigating is whether exchanging $\|d\|^{2}$ in (14) for a more general positive definite form $d^{\top} W d$


Fig. 1: Lena: original sharp image and the blurred one


Fig. 2: Reconstructed images, Tikhonov method (left), and solutions of the moment problem, $p=1, \lambda=12$ (middle), and $p=b, \lambda=0.11$ (right).


Fig. 3: Moon: original sharp image and the blurred one


Fig. 4: Reconstructed images, Tikhonov method (left), and solutions of the moment problem with $p=b, \lambda=0.4$ (right).
giving different weights to the error components could improve the reconstruction.

An obvious downside is that the number of basis functions is very high. One could investigate whether including a sparsity promoting regularization term in the cost function could improve numerics.

Instead of using the blurred image as a prior one could try to modify the procedure in the style of $[19,20]$ to use estimated logarithmic moments. How to actually construct such estimates is however an open question.
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