LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1: Architecture of a general CBIR system 2

Fig. 1.2: Sample mammogram 4

Fig. 2.1: Sample images of Wang database 44

Fig. 2.2: Sample images of OT database 44

Fig. 2.3: Sample mammograms of different classes 45

Fig. 3.1: Proposed retrieval framework based on fusion of fast features and weighted similarity measure 62

Fig.3.2: Proposed CBIR system based on query classification using random forests 63

Fig. 3.3: Retrieval results using proposed fusion based feature and weighted similarity measure on different sample queries. a. Beach b. Mountain-Hill 66

Fig. 3.4: Average feature extraction time for one image 68

Fig. 3.5: Comparative analysis of the proposed work with other methods 70

Fig. 3.6: Overall average precision compared with different measures 70

Fig. 3.7 (a-b): Retrieval results for two sample queries: (a). Forest and (b). Street for OT scene database. 72

Fig.3.8: Comparative analysis of overall average precision 72

Fig. 3.9 (a-b): Retrieval result using proposed classification framework on different sample queries. (a). Beach (b). Mountain 73

Fig. 3.10: Random forest performance for different number of decision trees 75

Fig. 3.11: OCLBP Feature 82

Fig. 3.12: OCLBP Histogram for different sample images 82

Fig. 3.13: Proposed supervised learning based pre-clustering framework 86

Fig. 3.14: Tuning of gamma for training the classifier 87

Fig. 3.15: Proposed image retrieval framework using supervised learning 87

Fig. 3.16 (a-d): Sample retrieval for African and Elephant using conventional and proposed method 92

Fig.3.17: (a) Precision vs Class bar graph for retrieval of 50 images per query with different feature vectors. 94

Fig.3.17: (b) Recall vs Class bar graph for retrieval of 50 images per query with different feature vectors 95

Fig. 3.18 (a): Precision vs. No of images retrieved, (b) Recall vs. No of images retrieved 96

Fig.3.19 (a): Precision vs Class bar graph for retrieval of 50 images per query with different feature vectors 99

Fig.3.19 (b): Recall vs Class bar graph for retrieval of 50 images per query with different feature vectors 100

Fig. 3.20: (a) Precision vs. No of images retrieved, (b) Recall vs. No of images retrieved 101

Fig. 4.1: Proposed framework for mammogram classification 110

Fig. 4.2: Cropping and filtering of a sample mammogram 111

Fig.4.3: First level decomposition 113

Fig. 4.4: Two- level wavelet decomposition of input mammogram 114

Fig. 4.5: 8-neighbouring connectivity in LBP and CS-LBP features.....116

Fig. 4.6: Block preparation of LL^2 sub-bands and $|LH^2+HL^2+HH^2|$ sub-bands 117

Fig. 4.7: LBP and CS-LBP histogram of a decomposed block.....118

Fig. 4.8: Working diagram of mammogram retrieval 122

Fig. 4.9: Comparison of feature dimensions 124

Fig. 4.10: Comparative performance analysis of W-LBP and WCS-LBP features 124

Fig.4.11: Classification accuracy and used number of features 125

Fig. 4.12: Statistical distribution of selected features through SVM-RFE 125

Fig. 4.13: Performance of random forests on different number of trees 127

Fig. 4.14: Retrieval accuracy as compare to conventional approach..... 131

Fig. 4.15: Retrieval speed-up of the proposed classification-cum-retrieval framework 131

Fig. 4.16: Sample of mammogram retrieval 133

Fig. 5.1: Sample mammogram with artifacts..... 136

Fig. 5.2: Proposed mammogram retrieval framework..... 139

Fig. 5.3 (a-h): Artifacts suppression steps for two different sample images 141

Fig.5.4 (a-d): Pectoral muscle removal and smoothing for same sample mammogram 142

Fig. 5.5: Sample images based on background tissues..... 144

Fig. 5.6 (a-b): Segmentation of sample mammogram 147

Fig. 5.7: Process of the proposed WCS-LBP feature extraction 148

Fig. 5.8: MAP Structure and SOM Neighbour..... 151

Fig. 5.9 (a-b): SOM weight position and sample hits..... 154

Fig.5.10 (a-f): Different comparative retrieval for abnormal classes: Fig. 5.10(a-c) Traditional versus SOM Clustering and Fig.5.10 (d-f) SOM clustering and different variants feature set. 157

Fig. 5.11: Comparative analysis of feature dimensions..... 157

Fig. 5.12: Average precision for normal and abnormal mammograms 158

Fig. 5.13: Overall mean of average precision for the proposed framework 159

Fig. 5.14: Comparative analysis for normal and abnormal query 159

Fig.5.15 (a-e) Sample retrieval form different classes: (a): Fatty, (b): Ill-defined masses, (c): Circumscribed Masses, (d): Architectural Distortion, and (e): Dense classes 161