Connected

Component Labeling using MPI

Kun Lin

CSE633

University at Buffalo The State University of New York





Table of Content

- Problem Description
- Sequential Algorithm
- Parallel Approach
- Results and Comparisons
- Conclusion



Problem Description

Connected-component labeling, also known for region extraction or region labeling is a graph theory problem.

- Goal is to detect unique region in a binary image where each unique region is given an unique label.
- Each foreground pixel can be considered an vertex, vertices are neighbors if they're one pixel spacing away. We could have four-connected neighbors or eight connected neighbors

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	1	1	0	0	1	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	2	2	2
1	1	1	0	0	2	0
1	1	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	3	0	2	0
0	0	3	3	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	4	4

3



Real world applications



Labeling CT cross-section

Application on clustering scene



Two Pass algorithm (sequential)

Processor will scan through the image two times (row major)

First pass:

- If the pixel x is a foreground pixel, check the its neighbors that is above x and on the left of x.
- If two neighbor are background pixel, then x will have a new unique label, or if only one of them is foreground pixel with existing label, then x will be assign same label
- If two neighbor are both foreground pixel and have different label we will take the min but set up a equivalent list

Second pass:

- Re-labeling each foreground pixel based on its lowest equivalent list

0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	3	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
4		_																
	=,	2																
1	= :	3																

5

University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Parallel Approach

- Divide the image by rows, where each processor get some row intervals of image
- Each Processor locally compute two pass algorithm on the local image
- All processor will pass only the neighboring row result to root processor, then root processor will compute a global equivalent list and broadcast the list to all processor
- Then all processors will perform second pass that will re-label all its local necessary pixels



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Equivalent list example

- Currently using dictionary as data structure to store equivalent list
 - Where 1=> 2; 1=> 3 will store as
 Dictionary [1] => [2, 3]

Some possible cases





Individual result from each node

Combined result



Labeling 16 x 16 size image, divide data into 4 node, each have size 4x16 data

Boundary labels send to root node to compute global equivalent list then bcast the result for relabeling







University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Testing parallel runs

- Using MPI Library and UB CCR academic cluster
- Programs are ran in range of 1 128 CPUs, tested on image size 2⁷ x 2⁷ and 2⁸ x 2⁸
- Data could be divide in many ways, for this experiment they are divided by row, which is straightforward to keep track of index and corresponding communication between processors



Results of 128 X 128 Graph

# Processors	Time (s)				
2	1.51				
4	0.384				
8	0.153				
16	0.25				
32	2.286				
64	10.13				
128	39.20				

Time (s)

Time (s) vs. # of Node for 128 x 128 image



of Node

Results of 256 X 256 Graph

# Processors	Time (s)				
2	87				
4	14.102				
8	2.246				
16	1.3				
32	3.37				
64	13.113				
128	61.065				

Time(s)

Time(s) vs. # of Node 256 x 256 image



of Node

By University at Buffalo The Same University Speed up / Scaling

Let two node's runtime be our base case

# Processors	Scaling
2	1
4	6.169
8	38.736
16	66.923
32	25.82
64	1.425





of Node

Conclusion

- Parallel Component labeling showed faster run time than sequential
- Using number of node in range from 4 32 we can see a significant speed up as input image size increases, as we adding more nodes, we tends to see longer run time that might be cause by too much processor communication
- Graph tested for this project are randomly generated
 - Real world image's pixel tends to be more cluster and separate, which will work well with this parallel implementation



Reference:

- R. Miller and L. Boxer, Algorithms Sequential and Parallel: A Unified approach
- Connected-componenet labeling wikipedia <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Connected-component_labeling</u>
- Parallel Programming with MPI For python <u>https://rabernat.github.io/research_computing/parallel-programming-with-mpi-for-python.html</u>
- Image 1 Slide 3 http://k-sience.blogspot.com/2017/06/object-counting-using-connected.html
- Connected Component Udacity youtube-channel
- http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~grauman/courses/378/slides/lecture3_full.pdf

Questions?