

Gradually Varied Surfaces and Gradually Varied Functions

Li Chen

Department of Computer Science

Wuhan University, China

and

Department of Mathematics

Southeast University, China

The gradually varied surface was introduced and studied in digital and discrete spaces by Chen. The basic idea of introducing gradually varied surfaces is to employ a purely discrete interpolation algorithm to fit a discrete surface when the desired surface is not required to be “smooth.” In this paper, we generalize the concept of gradually varied surfaces. A digital surface is defined as a mapping f from an n -dimensional digital manifold D into an m -dimensional grid space Σ_m . A discrete surface is said to be gradually varied if two points in D , p , and q are adjacent, implying $f(p)$ and $f(q)$ are adjacent in Σ_m . We have proved the following constructive theorem: Let $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$ be an indirectly adjacent grid space. Given a subset J of D and a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow i\text{-}\Sigma_m$, if the distance of any two points p and q in J is not less than the distance of $f_J(p)$ and $f_J(q)$ in $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$, then there exists an extension mapping f of f_J , such that the distance of any two points p and q in D is not less than the distance of $f(p)$ and $f(q)$ in $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$. That is to say, the guiding point set $(J, f(J))$ has a gradually varied surface fitting. In other words, any digital manifold (graph) can normally immerse an arbitrary $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$. We also show that any digital manifold (graph) can normally immerse an arbitrary tree T . Furthermore, we will discuss the gradually varied function, which is a gradually varied surface in the case of $m = 1$ in $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$ or integer set Z . An envelope theorem, a uniqueness theorem, and an extension theorem which concerns preserving the same norm, are obtained. Finally, we will show an optimal uniform approximation theorem of gradually varied functionals and develop an efficient algorithm for the approximation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Before Newton-Leibnitz’s time, mathematics was basically “discrete.” Since then, continuous mathematics has dominated the literature. But discrete mathematics has found new life with the appearance and widespread use of the digital computer. However, we still prefer to use the thinking involved in continuous mathematics.

For example, if we had discrete information on some samples, we would assume a

Address: Current Address: Li Chen, Associate Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of the District of Columbia, 4200 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20008, lchen@udc.edu. The research was supported by Chinese Academy of Sciences.

continuous model to do the calculation. Sometimes, we need a discrete output from the continuous solution, and it is not hard to re-digitize the continuous results.

For some problems, going from “discrete” to “continuous” back to “discrete” may not always be necessary. In such instances, we can directly employ a methodology to go from “discrete input” to “discrete output.” The tractability and practice of the methodology using such a philosophy is certainly valid. Let’s consider an example. In seismic data processing, the seismic data sets consist of synchronous records of reflected seismic signals registered by a large number of geophones (seismic sensors) placed along a straight line or in the nodes of a rectangular lattice on the earth’s surface. A series of explosions serve as the source of the initial seismic pulse, responses to which are averaged in a special manner. The vertical time axis forming the resulting two- or three-dimensional picture is identified with depth, so that the peculiarities of the reflected signal under the respective sensor carries information on the local properties of the rock mass at the respective point of the underground medium. In contrast to the above-lying sedimentary cover, the absence of pronounced reflecting surfaces in a crystalline body makes it difficult to infer the geological information from the basement interval of the seismic picture. We can see that layer description (or modeling) becomes a central problem. If we know a target layer in each horizontal or vertical (line) profile, we can get the entire layer in the 3D stratum. It can be transferred into a surface fitting problem where we can use a Coones surface, Bezier polynomial, or B-spline to fit the surfaces. See Fig. 1.1.

Based on the boundary values to fill the interior, the most suitable technique is a Coones surface. However, for a layer, one must make two surfaces, one for the top of the layer and one for the bottom. The Coons surfaces have no property of preserving a fitted surface in the convex of a guiding point set. That is to say, the upper surface may intersect with the lower surface. That is not a desired solution. Since there are many sampled points on measured lines, the Bezier polynomial is also not a




Fig. 1.1. (a)The layer described by perpendicular lines and (b)the layer described by arbitrary lines.

good choice—One cannot make the order of the polynomial very high. B-spline is a very good choice for the problem, but we need to do a pre-partition and coordinate transformations. In fact, for the problem, we have no special requirements for the smoothness, and we just need two reasonable surfaces to cover the layer.

Another example is from computer vision. In observing an image, if you extract an object from the image, a representation of the object can sometimes be described by its boundary curve. If all values on the boundary are the same, then we can just fill the region. If the values on the boundary are not the same, and if we assume that the values are "continuous" on the boundary, then one needs a fitting algorithm to find a surface. Fig. 1.2 shows the example if the center of the object was removed, how do we fill it. Its solution will have direct application in image compression. Since the boundary is irregular, the 2D B-spline needs to partition the boundary into four segments to form a XY -plane vs UV -plane translation. The different partitions may yield different results.

Practically, the procedure of a computation is a set of "discrete" actions. The input of a curve is also discrete, and the output is discrete. We can, therefore, make the following arguments. Do we always need a continuous technique for surface fitting? Is it possible to have a discrete fitting algorithm to get a reasonable




Fig. 1.2. An irregular gradually varied boundary example.

surface for the above problems? In 1990, Chen (1990) developed an algorithm to do such discrete surface fitting in 2D [1]. The algorithm is called gradually varied fitting.

This paper will expand on and generalize the idea of discrete surface fitting on a plane to a generalized discrete space, namely a discrete manifold. We will consider building a systemic theory over the discrete manifold. We will first describe a discrete manifold, then define the gradually varied surfaces on the discrete manifold. Then, we will give the major theorems of this paper, which are the theorem of interpolation and the expanding theorem of gradually varied surfaces. We will also discuss the gradually varied manifold over discrete manifolds.

We will go on to consider several kinds of gradually varied operators and study the properties of these operators. We will also define the gradually varied functional and its norm. We will prove the expanding theorem that preserves the norm of a gradual varied function. We will also prove the uniqueness theorem and its corollary. We will also discuss the approximation problem of gradually varied functions.

Since the purpose of introducing gradually varied surfaces is for applications in image processing, the existence of fast algorithms is a really significant issue. We will develop fast algorithms for the interpolation and approximation of gradually varied surfaces.

2. GRADUALLY VARIED MAPPING

The gradually varied surface was originally designed for digital surface fitting without using any assumption of continuous functions such as splines and Bezier polynomials in geophysical data processing [1] [2] [3], [4]. A gradually varied surface can be viewed as a discrete function f from Σ_2 to $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ satisfying $|f(a) - f(b)| \leq 1$ if a and b are adjacent in Σ_2 . This concept is called “discretely continuous” by Rosenfeld [5] and “roughly continuous” by Pawlak [6]. A gradually varied function can be represented by λ -connectedness [7], [4], [9], [10].

Definition 2.1. *Let D_1 and D_2 be two discrete manifolds and $f : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ be a mapping. f is said to be an immersion from D_1 to D_2 or a gradually varied operator if x and y are adjacent in D_1 implying $f(x) = f(y)$, or $f(x), f(y)$ are adjacent in D_2 .*

If $D_2 = \Sigma_m$, then f is called a gradually varied surface. An immersion f is said to be an embedding if f is a one-to-one mapping.

In fact, D_1 and D_2 can be two simple graphs in the above definition. (See [11] for concepts of graph theory.) In this case, we know a famous NP -complete problem [12], the subgraph isomorphism problem, is related to the gradually varied operator.

Lemma 2.1. *There is no polynomial time algorithm to decide if a graph D can embed to another graph D' unless $P = NP$.*

However, if the number of adjacent points to each point in D and D' are not greater than a constant C and $|D| = |D'|$, then there is a polynomial time algorithm to decide if $|D|$ and $|D'|$ are isomorphic. On the other hand, the immersion problem is trivial because we can always let the image of all points in D be a certain point in D' .

There is another related NP -complete problem. An immersion is said to be a morphism if for $a' = f(a)$, where b' is an adjacent point of a' , then there is a

$b \in f^{-1}(b')$ such that a, b are adjacent. To decide whether or not an immersion is a morphism is *NP*-hard.

This paper does not deal with the above complexity problems. It focuses on how to get the entire mapping using the property of immersion for a given part of a mapping, .

Mathematically, the main problem of the paper: Let D and D' be two discrete manifolds. Assume J is a subset of D , if $f_J : J \rightarrow D'$ is known, then there is an extension of f_J , f_D , such that $f_D : D \rightarrow D'$ is gradually varied, where an extension means that $f_J(a) = f_D(a)$ if $a \in J$.

This problem has direct use in image reconstruction. A 2D gray-scale digital image is a mapping $f : \Sigma_2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Let's consider an example. In geophysical prospecting, there is an important problem, namely layer description or modeling, which uses an arrangement of nets consisting of horizontal and vertical lines. If we know the object layer in each horizontal or vertical line, we can get the entire layer in the stratum. This is a simple surface-fitting problem, where we could use a Coones surface, Bezier polynomial, or a B-spline to fit the surface. However, we can represent the complete gray-level (usually 0-255) as a chain, which links each pair of $(i - 1, i)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 255\}$. To fit the surface is to find a gradually varied function with respect to the chain. See Fig. 1.1.

It is easy to see that if f is a gradually varied mapping, then

$$\forall_{p,q \in D} d(p, q) \geq d(f(p), f(q)), \quad (2.1)$$

where $d(x, y)$ is the length of the shortest path between x and y . The key theorem for extension was proven by Chen [1], which states:

Theorem 2.1 ([1], [3]).

Let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m be m rational numbers with $A_1 < A_2 < \dots < A_m$, and let J be a nonempty subset of graph D . Suppose that $f_J : J \rightarrow \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$, the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a gradually varied extension

f_D is for all x, y in J , $d(x, y) \geq d(f_J(x), f_J(y))$, where $d(f_J(x), f_J(y)) = |i - j|$ if $f_J(x) = A_i$ and $f_J(y) = A_j$.

We also knew that,

Theorem 2.2 ([3]). *If there is a gradually varied extension f_D of f_J , then there exists two gradually varied extensions f_D^1 and f_D^2 such that, for every gradually varied extension f_D , $f_D^1(x) \leq f_D \leq f_D^2$ for all $x \in D$.*

We also discussed fast algorithms for the gradually varied extension in [1], [2].

3. GRADUALLY VARIED EXTENSION AND NORMAL IMMERSION

We can see that Theorem 2.1 is an ideal case. However, not every D, D' can preserve such a property, i.e. the existence of gradually varied extension. For example, consider D and D' as shown in Fig. 3.1 (a) and (b), respectively. If $J = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and f_J is indicated in Fig. 3.1 (b), then we can see that $\langle J, f_J \rangle$ satisfies the condition in Theorem 2.1. But for point x , there is no $f(x)$ that can be selected to satisfy the condition of gradual variation.




Fig. 3.1. The example that shows no gradually varied extension.

In order to do more profound research and make the terminology simpler, we propose a new concept as follows:

Definition 3.1. Let J be a subset of D and f_J be a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow D'$, which satisfies:

$$\forall p, q \in J [d(p, q) \geq d(f_J(p), f_J(q))]. \quad (3.1)$$

If there exists an extension f of f_J such that $f : D \rightarrow D'$ is a gradually varied mapping, then we say $\langle J, f_J \rangle$ is immersion-extendable. If every $\langle J, f_J \rangle$ satisfying (3.1) is immersion-extendable, then we say that D can normally immerse into D' .

Mathematically, it might be very difficult to decide whether or not a general graph/digital manifold can normally immerse into another one. This problem may be *NP*-hard (See Cormen, Leiserson, and Rivest's book, [12]). However, in the use of data fitting, pattern recognition, and computer vision, we can find several important and useful digital manifolds in which normal immersion and general gradually varied surfaces are applicable. In other words, given some guiding points and their (mapping) values in such a discrete manifold, we can find a gradually varied surface based on the guiding points.

The m -dimensional grid space Σ_m is the set of all points in n -dimensional Euclidean space with integer coordinates. There are many kinds of adjacency, and we present two of them here, which are most often used in discrete geometry. First, two points $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$ are directly adjacent if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^m (|p_i - q_i|) = 1$. Such a digital space is called a directly adjacent space and is denoted by $d\Sigma_m$. Second, two points $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$ are indirectly adjacent if and only if $Max_{i=1}^m (|p_i - q_i|) = 1$. Such a digital space is called an indirectly adjacent space and is denoted by $i\Sigma_m$. In addition, the n -simplicial decomposition space is denoted by Δ_n .

We know that Theorem 2.1 states that any digital manifold can normally immerse to Σ_1 or a chain. We can show a more general theorem in the following:

Theorem 3.1. Any graph D (or digital manifold) can normally immerse an arbitrary tree T .

Proof Suppose that $J \neq \emptyset$ is a subgraph of D , and a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow T$ satisfies (3.1), where T is a tree. We will prove that there exists a gradually varied mapping $f : D \rightarrow T$ with $f_J(p) = f(p)$, $p \in J$.

The proof of the theorem is a constructive proof. For every $p \in J$, let $f(p) = f_J(p)$, and let $f(p) = \theta$ if $p \in D - J$. Denote

$$D_0 = \{p \mid f(p) \neq \theta \& p \in D\}. \quad (3.2)$$

For any p and p' in D_0 , we have $d(p, p') \geq d(f(p), f(p'))$.

If $D_0 \neq D$, we can find a point x in $D - D_0$ such that x has an adjacent $r \in D_0$, then we have two cases:

1) If $d(r, p) > d(f(r), f(p))$ for every $p \in D_0$ with $p \neq r$, then let $f(x) = f(r)$.

Since $d(r, x) = 1$ is not less than $d(f(x), f(r)) = 0$ and

$$d(x, p) \geq d(r, p) - 1 > d(f(r), f(p)) - 1,$$

$d(x, p) \geq d(f(r), f(p)) \geq d(f(x), f(p))$. Let $D_0 \leftarrow D_0 \cup \{x\}$ and return to repeat.

2) If there is a point $p \in D_0$ such that $d(r, p) = d(f(r), f(p))$, then let

$$R_1 = \{p \mid d(r, p) = d(f(r), f(p)), p \in D_0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

According to (3.3), there are only two instances:

2.1) If for every p in R_1 , $d(r, p) < d(r, x) + d(x, p)$, then $d(r, p) < 1 + d(x, p)$, so $d(x, p) \geq d(r, p)$. Let $f(x) = f(r)$. If $p \in R_1$, then $d(x, p) \geq d(r, p) \geq d(f(r), f(p)) \geq d(f(x), f(p))$; else, i.e., p in $D_0 - R_1$, since $d(r, p) > d(f(r), f(p))$ then

$$d(x, p) \geq d(r, p) - 1 \geq d(f(r), f(p)) \geq d(f(x), f(p)).$$

Let $D_0 \leftarrow D_0 \cup \{x\}$ and return to repeat.

2.2) If there is some p in R_1 such that

$$d(r, p) = d(r, x) + d(x, p) = 1 + d(x, p),$$

then x is obviously in a shortest path between r and p . In the following, we will fix the point p . For every $q \in D_0$ with $q \neq r$ and $q \neq p$, we have $d(p, q) \leq$

$d(p, x) + d(x, q)$. Let

$$m(x) = \{q \mid d(x, q) \leq d(q, r), q \in D_0\}. \quad (3.4)$$

There are only two cases to discuss:

2.2.1) If $q \in m(x)$, then $d(p, q) \leq d(p, x) + d(x, q) \leq d(r, p) - 1 + d(r, q)$. Also, since p belongs to R_1 ,

$$d(p, q) \leq d(r, p) + d(r, q) - 1, \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$d(p, q) \leq d(f(r), f(p)) + d(r, q) - 1. \quad (3.6)$$

Three cases can be derived by the above equation (3.6):

2.2.1.1) If $d(r, q) \geq d(f(r), f(q)) + 2$, then $d(x, q) \geq d(r, q) - 1 \geq d(f(r), f(q)) + 1$.

Therefore,

$d(f(x), f(r)) \leq 1$ implies $d(x, q) \geq d(f(x), f(q))$. Just let $f(x) = f(r)$.

2.2.1.2) If $d(r, q) = d(f(r), f(q))$, then by using (3.6) and $p \in R_1$,

$$d(p, q) \leq d(f(r), f(q)) + d(f(r), f(p)) - 1. \quad (3.7)$$

Because T is a tree, T has one and only one path between $f(p)$ and $f(q)$, which must be a shortest path. If this path contains the point $f(r) \in T$, then

$$d(f(p), f(q)) = d(f(r), f(q)) + d(f(r), f(p)) \quad (3.8)$$

and by using (3.7), we can obtain

$$d(p, q) \leq d(f(p), f(q)) - 1.$$

A contradiction occurs for the assumption of p and q in D_0 . Hence, this path is not through $f(r)$.

(The paper was translated from Chinese, the previous one missed the following paragraph) **One can view $D' = T$ to be the tree with $f(r)$ as the root. When the path does not go through $f(r)$, $f(p)$ and $f(q)$ must be in the same proper subtree of T . There must be an α that is adjacent to $f(r)$ such that**

$$d(\alpha, f(p)) = d(f(r), f(p)) - 1$$

$$d(\alpha, f(q)) = d(f(r), f(q)) - 1.$$

let $f(x) = \alpha$. (It was not added since the last paragraph of the Chinese version the proof stated such a valuation. We can easily get $d(x, p) \geq d(f(x), f(p))$. And for all q , we have $d(x, q) \geq d(f(x), f(q))$.)

2.2.1.3) If $d(r, q) = d(f(r), f(q)) + 1$, then

i) If $d(x, q) \geq d(r, q)$, then $d(x, q) \geq d(f(r), f(q)) + 1$. This case is similar to 2.2.1.1).

ii) If $d(x, q) = d(r, q) - 1$ and according to the fixed p with $d(r, p) = 1 + d(x, p)$ and $d(r, p) = d(f(r), f(p))$, we have

$$d(p, q) \leq d(p, x) + d(x, q) \leq d(r, q) + d(r, p) - 2,$$

so $d(p, q) \leq d(f(r), f(q)) + 1 + d(f(r), f(p)) - 2$.

It is similar to 2.2.1.2).

2.2.2) If $q \in D_0 - m(x)$, i.e., $d(x, q) \geq d(r, q) + 1$, then

$$d(x, q) \geq d(f(r), f(q)) + 1.$$

It is similar to 2.2.1.1). Let $f(x) = f(r)$. (We have complete the mathematical proof here. The following discussion relates to algorithm design.)

To summarize, if there is a point p in R_1 , such that

$$d(r, p) = 1 + d(x, p) = d(r, x) + d(x, p),$$

then for any q in $D_0 - \{r, p\}$, it must be included in M_1 or M_2 , where M_1 is

$$M_1 = \{q \mid d(x, q) \geq d(f(r), f(q)) + 1, q \in D_0 - \{r, p\}\}.$$

We can choose $f(x) = f(r)$ or make $f(x)$ adjacent to $f(r)$ in the tree T .

$M_2 = \{q \mid \text{exists a shortest path between } f(p) \text{ and } f(q)$
that is not through $f(r), q \in D_0 - \{r, p\} \}$

Let $F_2 = \{f(q) \mid q \in M_2\}$. We can see that the point $f(r)$ is the root of the tree T . It is easier to see that every point in $F_2 \cup \{f(p)\}$ is included in a subtree of the tree. Thus, there exists a node t in T , such that $d(f(r), t) = 1$ and

$$\forall_{s \in F_2 \cup \{f(p)\}} d(f(r), s) = d(t, s) + 1.$$

Thus, let $f(x) = t$. In fact, if the path between $f(r)$ and $f(p)$ is $f(r), s_1, \dots, s_{l-1}, f(p)$, then $t = s_1$. Up to now we have obtained the proof of Theorem 3.1. \diamond

Corollary 3.1. *Any graph/digital manifold can normally immerse into an arbitrary forest.*

Theorem 3.2. *Any graph/digital manifold D can normally immerse into i_{Σ_m} .*

Proof Let D be a digital manifold. Suppose that J is a subset of D and $J \neq \emptyset$, and a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow i_{\Sigma_m}$ satisfies (3.1). We can denote

$$f_J(x) = (f_J^{(1)}(x), f_J^{(2)}(x), \dots, f_J^{(m)}(x)),$$

and we have, for any two points p and q ,

$$d(p, q) \geq d(f_J(p), f_J(q)).$$

Since

$$d(f_J(p), f_J(q)) = \text{Max}\{d(f_J^{(k)}(p), f_J^{(k)}(q)) \mid k = 1, \dots, m\},$$

then

$$d(p, q) \geq d(f_J^{(k)}(p), f_J^{(k)}(q)), k = 1, \dots, m.$$

Let $f_J^{(k)} : J \rightarrow i_{\Sigma_m}$, where

$$f_J^{(k)}(x) = (0, \dots, 0, f_J^{(k)}(x), 0, \dots, 0). \quad (3.9)$$

By theorem 3.1, we have m gradually varied extensions as follows:

$$f^{(k)} : D \rightarrow i_{\Sigma_m}, k = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, we can combine the m gradually varied extensions into a unique mapping:

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^m f^{(k)}(x).$$

preserving $f(p) = f_J(p)$, $p \in J$. Also, if p and q are adjacent in D , then by (3.10)

$$d(f(p), f(q)) = \text{Max}\{d(f[k](p), f[k](q)) | k = 1, \dots, m\} \leq 1.$$

Hence, f is a gradually varied extension of f_J . \diamond

Theorem 3.3. (1) A $d\text{-}\Sigma_m$ cannot normally immerse into itself, for $m > 1$.

(2) A Δ_n , $n > 2$, cannot normally immerse into itself.

(3) A $d\text{-}\Sigma_m$ or $i\text{-}\Sigma_m$ cannot normally immerse into Δ_n , for $n > 2$. (4) A Δ_n , $n > 2$, cannot normally immerse into $d\text{-}\Sigma_m$.

Proof We only need to list some counter-examples to prove this theorem.

(1) Assume the D, D' which are given in Fig. 3.2 (a), (b). If $J = \{p, q, s, r\}$ and $f_J = \{p', q', s', r'\}$ with $f_J(a) = a'$, we know for all $a, b \in J$, $d(a, b) \geq d(f_J(a), f_J(b))$. However, for $x \in D$, $f_J(x)$ can only be assigned as x' , or x'' . Neither x' nor x'' can satisfy the condition of gradual variation.

(2) For $\langle \Delta_n, \Delta_m \rangle$, $m, n > 2$, let the mapping f_J have the domain $J = \{a, b, c\}$ and the range $f_J = \{a', b', c'\}$ in Fig 3.2. (c), (d). We cannot find the image of $x \in D$ satisfying the condition of gradual variation.

(3) For $\langle d\text{-}\Sigma_m, \Delta_n \rangle$, the proof is similar to (2) with respect to Fig. 3.2. (e), (f).

(4) For $\langle i\text{-}\Sigma_m, \Delta_n \rangle$, the proof is similar to (2) with respect to Fig. 3.2. (g), (h). \diamond

The above results tell us that using $d\text{-}\Sigma_m$ or Δ_n to be range-domain, there is basically no “continuous image.”

A real world concrete example that supports the above results is the RGB-color table. Suppose we have a domain $D = \Sigma_2$ and a range space defined as $D' = \Delta_3$

with length C . See Fig. 3.2 (e). D' has three vertices R , G , and B at the three corners of D . R , G , and B represent “red,” “green,” and “blue.” For any point x' in D' , $d(x, R) + d(x, G) + d(x, B) = 2C$. So, if a point $x \in D$ and $f_J(x) = x'$, then we set the color $(r, g, b) = (C - d(x, R), C - d(x, G), C - d(x, B))$ to point x . We know the total color density of each point is the same, $C = r + g + b$. Theorem 3.3 tells us that if we wish to color some points in D , it is not always possible to get a “continuous” looking color image using an equal density of colors.

The question that arises is under what condition does this becomes always doable. We know that it is not only “for all $x, y \in J$, $d(x, y) \geq d(f_J(x), f_J(y))$.” In practice, one always fixes a color as a base color and adjusts the other two colors to get a continuous looking part of an image.

Definition 3.2. A (point-) connected component of a discrete manifold D is called a discrete sub-manifold S . A sub-manifold is said to be semi-convex if for any two points x, y in S , $d_S(x, y) = d_D(x, y)$.

The following is not difficult to prove:

Corollary 3.2. If D can normally immerse into D' , then any semi-convex sub-manifold of D can also normally immerse into D' .

Corollary 3.3. A complete graph K_n can normally immerse into any graph, and each graph can normally immerse into K_n .

There are two computer complexity issues:

(1) Is there any polynomial time algorithm to decide if D is normally immersible into D' ?

(2) More specifically, for a given $\langle D, D', J, f_J \rangle$, is there any polynomial algorithm that can obtain a gradually varied extension of f_J ? We think that answer is “No.”




Fig. 3.2. The examples that shows no gradually varied extension.

4. GRADUALLY VARIED FUNCTIONALS

In Section 2, we introduced the concept of gradually varied mapping. Then we discussed the general consideration of interpolation and extension for gradually varied surfaces in section 3. This section will focus on a special case of the range spaces, Σ_1 or $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ (it is also can be viewed as the integer set integers I). A mapping from D to Σ_1 is called a function. More precisely, let D be a “discretization or net sampling” of a metric space M . $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ is a “discretization” of the range of a functional f on M , $f : \rightarrow R$, where R represents the real number. In this case, we want to study, in detail, the gradually varied extension.

After discussion of the theoretical relation between the gradually varied functional and the metric space, we will concentrate mainly on the envelope theorem, uniqueness, and the norm-preserving extension theorem for gradually varied functionals.

Suppose that M is a constructive-compact-metric-space defined in Bishop and Bridges’s book [14]. Then there exists a routine which generates a sequence of a finite set M_1, \dots, M_n, \dots , such that M_n is a 2^{-n} net of M . Then M_n is a digital manifold, and the adjacent set of $x \in M$ is

$$\{y | y \in M_n \& w(x, y) < 2^{-n}, \text{ where } w \text{ is the metric of } M \}.$$

Let f be a continuous functional on M (f is also a uniform continuous functional [14]). Therefore, for any l , there exists n such that: if $w(x, y) < 2^{-n}$, then $|f(x) - f(y)| < 2^{-l}$.

Now, we construct a functional f_n on M_n as follows. Let $A(s) = s \cdot 2^{-l}$, and set $f_n(x) = A(s)$, where $s = \min\{t | f(x) \leq A(t) \& x \in M_n\}$. Then f_n is a 2^{-n} -uniform approximation of f on M_n .

Lemma 4.1. $f_n : M_n \rightarrow \{A(s)\}$ is gradually varied on M_n .

Proof If x and y are adjacent in M_n , then $w(x, y) < 2^{-n}$, and $|f(x) - f(y)| < 2^{-l}$. If $f_n(x) \leq f_n(y)$, then $f(x) \leq f_n(x) \leq f_n(y) \leq f(y)$. Thus,

$0 \leq f_n(y) - f_n(x) \leq f_n(y) - f(x) \leq f_n(y) - f(y) + f(y) - f(x) < 2 \cdot 2^{-l}$,
 so $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < 2 \cdot 2^{-l}$. Similarly, in case of $f_n(x) > f_n(y)$, we can also obtain
 $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < 2 \cdot 2^{-l}$. That is, assume $f_n(x) = A(s)$ and $f_n(y) = A(t)$, then we
 must have $|t - s| < 2$. Hence, f_n is gradually varied. \diamond

(M_n, f_n) is said to be an (n, l) -uniform approximation of (M, f) . The process
 of generating $\{(M(n), f_n), n \in I\}$ is called gradually varied approximating. In
 calculus, Weierstrass' approximation theorem tells us that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a
 polynomial f_p such that f_p is an ϵ -uniform approximation of f . That is to say, the
 gradually varied function was reasonably proposed.

In addition to the concept of gradually varied functions (or functionals), n is the
 function of l . If there is an $m > 0$, such that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(l)}{l^m} = O(1), \quad (4.1)$$

then m is called the order of the gradually varied function.

For an arbitrary M, f , and $\epsilon > 0$, there is an m so that there is an m th-order
 gradually varied function that is an ϵ -uniform approximation of f .

Although the gradually varied functional is a special case of the gradually varied
 surface, the gradually varied functional has special characteristics. For gradually
 varied functionals, suppose that p and p' in J satisfying $d(p, p') = d(f(p), f(p'))$. The
 valuations of each point in the shortest path between p and p' are unique. This path
 is called non-abundant. In other words, a path is a non-abundant path if and only
 if it is the shortest path between two points, x and y , and $d(x, y) = d(f(x), f(y))$.

According to Theorem 2.1, we can immediately obtain:

Corollary 4.1. *Let J be a non-empty subset of D . If a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ has
 a gradually varying extension on D , Then the necessary and sufficient condition
 for the existence of a unique gradually varied extension is that any point a in D is
 on a non-abundant path whose two ends are in J .*

4.1 The envelope theorem

The following theorem deals with enveloping, which means that there exists a lower bound and an upper bound in all the gradually varied functions with respect to $\langle D, \Sigma_1, J, f_J \rangle$.

Theorem 4.1. *If J is a non-empty subset of D and a mapping $f_J : J \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ has a gradually varying extension on D , then there are two gradually varied functions S_1 and S_2 on D , such that every gradually varied function S is between S_1 and S_2 . In other word, for any $x \in D$, $S_1(x) \geq S(x) \geq S_2(x)$.*

Proof First, for all $x \in J$, let $S_1(x) = S_2(x) = f_J(x)$. For $x \notin J$, to get a large enough number t from $\{A_i | i \in Z\}$, let $S_1(x) = A_t$. Test the following inequality for x and each point p in J , i.e.,

$$d(x, p) \geq ? d(S_1(x), S_1(p)), \forall p \in J. \quad (4.2)$$

If the above statement is not true, then decrease t by 1, i.e., $t \leftarrow t - 1$, and repeat the process of testing. Since gradually varied functions of f_J exist, there must exist a t that satisfies the above equation. In addition, such a valuation satisfies:

$$\exists q \in J (f_J(q) < S_1(x) \ \& \ d(x, q) = d(S_1(x), S_1(q))). \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly, to get a small enough number s from $\{A_i | i \in Z\}$, let $S_2(x) = A_s$. Test the following inequality for x and each point p in J , i.e.,

$$d(x, p) \geq ? d(S_2(x), S_2(p)) \ \forall p \in J.$$

If the above statement is not true, then increase s by 1, i.e., $s \leftarrow s + 1$, and repeat the process of testing. Since gradually varied functions of f_J exist, there must exist an s that satisfies the above equation. In addition, such a valuation satisfies:

$$\exists q \in J (f_J(q) > S_2(x) \ \& \ d(x, q) = d(S_2(x), S_2(q))). \quad (4.4)$$

For each $x \in D - J$, $S_1(x)$ and $S_2(x)$ represent the upper and lower bound values, respectively, for any possible gradually varied functions. Thus, if f_D is a gradually varied extension of f_J , then,

$$\forall x \in D \{S_2(x) \leq f_D(x) \leq S_1(x)\}$$

The only thing that remains is to prove that $S_1(x)$ and $S_2(x)$ are gradually varied.

Let x, y be adjacent in D . If $d(S_1(x), S_1(y)) > 1$, we may assume that $S_1(y) < S_1(x)$. According to (4.3) we have a q such that

$$d(y, q) = d(S_1(y), S_1(q)) \text{ and } S_1(q) < S_1(y)$$

but,

$$d(S_1(x), S_1(q)) = d(S_1(x), S_1(y)) + d(S_1(y), S_1(q))$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d(S_1(x), S_1(q)) &\geq d(S_1(x), S_1(y)) \\ &\geq d(S_1(x), S_1(y)) + d(S_1(y), S_1(q)) \\ &> 1 + d(S_1(y), S_1(q)) \\ &> 1 + d(y, q) \end{aligned}$$

However, we know x and y are adjacent, so

$$d(x, q) \leq d(y, q) + 1.$$

So, a contradiction appears. Thus, $d(S_1(x), S_1(y)) \leq 1$. That is to say, S_1 is gradually varied. In the same way, we can prove that S_2 is gradually varied too. \diamond

4.2 The Norm-preserving Gradually Varied Extension

In functional analysis, if M is a linear norm(ed) space, then

$$\|f\| = \sup_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|f(x)\|}{\|x\|} = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|f(x)\|. \quad (4.5)$$

is called the norm of f .

How to define the norm for a gradually varied function is an interesting question.

Definition 4.1. Let f_D be a gradually varied functional on D . The length of the longest non-abundant path is called the norm of f_D , which is denoted by $\|f_D\|$.

$\|f_D\|$ has geometric meaning. The following is not difficult to prove:

Lemma 4.2. Let D be a discrete space, and f be a gradually varied functional on D . If the path p_0, \dots, p_n has the property of $f(p_0) < \dots < f(p_n)$, then p_0, \dots, p_n is a non-abundant path.

Theorem 4.2. subset J of D . If for some $n > 0$ we have:

- 1) for all p and p' in J , $d(p, p') \geq d(f_J(p), f_J(p'))$;
- 2) if $d(f_J(p), f_J(p')) = k \cdot n + i$, $0 \leq i < n$ then
 - a) $d(p, p') \geq k \cdot n + (k - 1)$, $i = 0$, or
 - b) $d(p, p') \geq k \cdot n + k + i$, $i \neq 0$,

then there exists a gradually varied extension f_D of f_J with $\|f_D\| \leq n$.

Conversely, 1) and 2) are necessary for a gradually varied extension f_D with $\|f_D\| \leq n$.

Proof First, for all $x \in J$, let $f(x) = f_J(x)$. Select $x \notin J$ and x has an adjacent point $r \in J$. Based on Theorem 2.1, f_J must have a gradually varied extension.

(i) Suppose that there is only one choice for $f(x)$ at point x .

(i.a) If $f(x) = f(r)$, then there exists two points $\xi, \eta \in J$ such that $d(x, \theta) = d(f(x), f(\xi))$ and $d(x, \eta) = d(f(x), f(\eta))$ with $f(\xi) < f(x) < f(\eta)$.

For any point $p \in J$, if $d(f(x), f(p)) = kn + i$, this implies

$$d(x, p) < kn + k - 1, \text{ if } i = 0,$$

or

$$d(x, p) < kn + k + i, \text{ if } i \neq 0.$$

Then, we might as well assume $f(p) > f(x)$, and

$$d(x, \xi) = k'n + i', 0 \leq k', 0 \leq i' < n.$$

Thus, if $i = 0$, we have,

$$d(x, \xi) \leq d(p, x) + d(x, \xi) < kn + k - 1 + k'n + i' < (k + k')n + k - 1 + i'.$$

On the other hand, $d(f(p), f(\xi)) \geq d(f(p), f(x)) + d(f(x), f(\xi)) \geq kn + k'n + i' \geq (k + k')n + i'$. Since $p, \xi \in J$, according to the second condition of the theorem, we have $d(p, \xi) \geq (k + k')n + (k + k' - 1) + i'$. It generates a contradiction. So, $d(x, p) > kn + k - 1$ when $i = 0$.

If $i \neq 0$, using the same strategy, we can prove that $d(x, p) < kn + k + i, i \neq 0$.

(i.b) If $f(x) \neq f(r)$, we might as well suppose that $f(r) > f(x)$, then there must be a ξ such that $f(r) > f(x) > f(\xi)$ and $d(f(x), f(\xi)) = d(x, \xi)$ because of the unique choice. We can get the same result as (i.a).

(ii) $f(x)$ has two or more choices for the condition of gradual variation. Because $f(r)$ is fixed, there are at most three choices for $f(x)$. Suppose that two of them are $f(x)$ and $F(x)$. If $d(f(x), F(x)) > 1$, then there is a valid choice in between. So, we can assume that $d(f(x), F(x)) = 1$. Thus, we know $f(r) = f(x)$ or $f(r) = F(x)$. We assume $f(r) = f(x)$.

Assuming that there is $p \in J$, the pair of $(x, f(x))$ and $(p, f(p))$ does not satisfy condition 2) in the theorem. That is, if $d(f(x), f(p)) = k \cdot n + i, 0 \leq i < n$ then

$$\begin{cases} (a) d(x, p) < k \cdot n + (k - 1) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ (b) d(x, p) < k \cdot n + k + i, & \text{if } i \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

(In addition, for $p' \in J$, the pair of $(x, F(x))$ and $(p', f(p'))$ does not satisfy condition 2) in the theorem. That is, if $d(F(x), f(p')) = k' \cdot n + i', 0 \leq i' < n$ then

$$(a) d(x, p') < k' \cdot n + (k' - 1), i' = 0, \text{ or,}$$

$$(b) d(x, p') < k' \cdot n + k' + i', i' \neq 0,)$$

Our strategy is to prove that if (4.6) is true, then we can find $F(x)$ that satisfies

condition 2) of the theorem.

(ii.a) If $f(p) > f(x)$, raise the assigned value on x by one level, namely $F(x)$. We have $F(x) > f(x)$ and $d(F(x), f(x)) = 1$. For all $\xi \in J$ satisfying $f(\xi) > f(x)$, then $d(F(x), f(\xi)) = d(f(x), f(\xi)) - 1 = kn + i - 1$; $d(x, \xi) \geq d(r, \xi) - 1 \geq kn + k - 1 - 1$ if $i = 0$; $d(x, \xi) \geq d(r, \xi) - 1 \geq kn + k + i - 1$ if $i \neq 0$.

If $i = 0$, then we have

$$d(F(x), f(\xi)) = (k - 1)n + (n - 1),$$

so

$$d(x, \xi) \geq kn + k - 2 > (k - 1)n + (n - 1) + (k - 1).$$

Thus, $F(x)$ satisfies condition 2) in the Theorem.

If $i \neq 0$, we have

$$d(F(x), f(\xi)) = kn + (i - 1),$$

so

$$d(x, \xi) \geq kn + k + (i - 1).$$

Whenever $i = 1$ or $i > 1$, $F(x)$ satisfies condition 2) in the Theorem.

For the second part of the theorem, we now consider all $\xi \in J$ satisfying $f(\xi) \leq f(x)$. If there is a ξ such that $d(F(x), f(\xi)) = k'n + i'$, then

$$\begin{cases} d(x, \xi) < k'n + k' - 1 & \text{if } i' = 0 \\ d(x, \xi) < k'n + k' + i' & \text{if } i' \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Since $f(\xi) \leq f(x) < F(x) < f(p)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(\xi), f(p)) &= d(f(\xi), F(x)) + d(F(x), f(p)) \\ &= d(f(\xi), F(x)) + d(f(x), f(p)) - 1 \\ &= k'n + i' + kn + i - 1 \\ &= (k' + k)n + (i' + i) - 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We know $d(\xi, p) \leq d(p, x) + d(x, \xi)$. Then,

(a) If $i = i' = 0$, according to (4.6) and (4.7), we have

$$d(p, x) < kn + (k - 1).$$

So,

$$d(p, x) \leq kn + (k - 1) - 1,$$

$$d(x, \xi) \leq k'n + (k' - 1) - 1,$$

and,

$$d(\xi, p) \leq d(p, x) + d(x, \xi) \leq (k + k' - 1)n + (k + k' - 1) + (n - 3).$$

On the other hand, by (4.8), we have $d(f(\xi), f(p)) = (k' + k - 1)n + (n - 1)$.

Since p, ξ are in J , according to condition 2) in the theorem, we have

$$d(\xi, p) \geq (k' + k - 1)n + (k + k' - 1) + (n - 1)$$

This causes a contradiction.

(b) If $i \neq 0$ and $i' = 0$, we have

$$d(\xi, p) \leq (k + k')n + (k + k') + (i - 3).$$

We also have $d(f(\xi), f(p)) = (k' + k)n + (i - 1)$. If $i = 1$, then

$$d(\xi, p) \geq (k' + k)n + (k + k') - 1.$$

If $i > 1$, then

$$d(\xi, p) \geq (k' + k)n + (k + k') + i.$$

So, there is a contradiction.

(c) If $i = 0$ and $i' \neq 0$, we can use the same method in (b) to prove the second part of the theorem.

(d) If $i \neq 0$ and $i' \neq 0$, we have

$$d(\xi, p) \leq (k + k')n + (k + k') + (i + i') - 2, \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$d(f(\xi), f(p)) = (k' + k)n + (i + i') - 1.$$

It is obvious that $(i + i') - 1 > 0$, and $(i + i') < 2n - 1$. Let $(i + i') - 1 = tn + j$, then $d(f(\xi), f(p)) = (k' + k + t)n + j$.

If $j = 0$, then $t > 0$ and

$$d(\xi, p) \geq (k' + k + t)n + (k + k' + t) - 1.$$

However, according to (4.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\xi, p) &\leq (k + k')n + (k + k') + (i + i') - 2 \\ &\leq (k + k')n + (k + k') + tn - 1 \\ &\leq (k + k' + t)n + (k + k') - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This causes a contradiction because $t > 0$.

If $j \neq 0$,

$$d(\xi, p) \geq (k' + k + t)n + (k + k' + t) + j.$$

But (4.9) tells us,

$$d(\xi, p) \leq (k + k')n + (k + k') + tn + j - 1 \leq (k + k' + t)n + (k + k') + j - 1.$$

So, there is a contradiction.

To summarize, we have proved that if $(x, f(x))$ and $(p, f(p))$ do not satisfy condition 2) in the theorem, then for $f(p) > f(x)$, we can find $F(x) > f(x)$ and $d(f(x), F(x)) = 1$ such that $(x, F(x))$ satisfies condition 2). It is not difficult to know if $f(p) < f(x)$; we just need to decrease one level of $f(x)$ to satisfy condition 2). That is to say, if $f(x) = A_i$, then $F(x) = A_{i-1}$ is the correct choice for the value on x .

We can repeat the above process to assign the value until all points $x \in D - J$ are valued.

We now verify $\|f\| \leq n$. If $\|f\| > n$, then there is a non-abundant path with the

length of $n + 1$. So, there is x, y such that $d(x, y) = d(f(x), f(y)) = n + 1$. However, according to condition 2), if $d(f(x), f(y)) = n + 1$, then $d(x, y) \geq n + 1 + 1 \geq n + 2$. This causes a contradiction. This completes the proof of the first part.

Conversely, if f is gradually varied and $\|f\| = n$, then we can prove that f satisfies conditions 1) and 2) of Theorem 4.2.

Suppose that f is gradually varied and $\|f\| = n$. Let there exist x, y in D and $d(f(x), f(y)) = kn + i$, for $0 \leq i < n$. If $d(x, y) \leq kn + k - 2$ when $i = 0$, then let $x = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_m = y$, $m < kn + k - 1$, be a shortest path between x and y . We might as well assume $f(x) < f(y)$. (If $m = n$, then there is a contradiction.)

Let's examine the first $n + 2$ points of the path, $x = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}$ —the length of p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n+1} is $n + 1$. If we have $f(p_0) < f(p_1) < \dots < f(p_{n+1})$, then $\|f\| > n$. Thus, there must be an i , where $i \leq n$, such that $f(p_i) \geq f(p_{i+1})$. Such a point $f(p_i)$ is called a separating point. The second separating point must appear before p_{2n+1}, \dots , and so forth. That is to say, if we know $d(x, y) \geq kn$, then there must be $k - 1$ separating points. So $d(x, y) \geq kn + k - 1$. For $i \neq 0$, we can prove this statement in the same way. \diamond

4.3 The discussion of the results of uniqueness, enveloping, and norm-preserving

In practice, the purpose of norm-preserving a gradually varied extension is to simulate the famous Hahn-Banach theorem in functional analysis. Based on Theorem 4.2, we can easily obtain:

Theorem 4.3. *Let D be a discrete manifold and J be a convex sub-manifold. If the function f_J satisfies the condition of gradual variation, then there is a gradually varied extension of f_J, f_D , such that $\|f_D\| = \|f_J\|$.*

Even though we do not simulate the Hahn-Banach theorem, Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 are still meaningful. They state how to get a gradually varied surface without adding the “gradient.” The proof of the theorem 4.2 also gives an algorithm to

construct such a function.

The enveloping theorem, Theorem 4.1, tells us the limitations of the family of gradually varied functions with respect to f_J . We can easily get the following results.

Corollary 4.2. *Let S_1 and S_2 be upper and lower envelop surfaces. Then,*

$$S_{m+} = \{ \langle x, S_{m+}(x) \rangle \mid S_{m+}(x) = A_{\frac{i+j}{2}}, A_i = S_1(x) \& A_j = S_2(x) \},$$

and

$$S_{m-} = \{ \langle x, S_{m-}(x) \rangle \mid S_{m-}(x) = A_{\frac{i+j}{2}}, A_i = S_1(x) \& A_j = S_2(x) \}.$$

are also gradually varied.

Using the same method, we can get a so-called major family of gradually varied functions based on the $A_{\frac{a_i+b_j}{a+b}}$ scheme, where a and b are integers.

5. OPTIMAL UNIFORM APPROXIMATION AND SURFACE FITTING

The nature of a gradually varied extension is a type of interpolation. When $\langle J, f_J \rangle$ does not satisfy the condition of gradual variation, we would naturally consider its approximation. In other words, we want to find a gradually varied function f that has the minimum distance to f_J . In numerical analysis, there are two kinds of common approximations: uniform approximation and least squares approximation.

In previous sections, we described the necessary and sufficient condition of the gradually varied extension. Given a digital manifold D , its a non-empty subset J , and a function $f_J : J \rightarrow \{A_i \mid i \in Z\}$, where $A_{i-1} < A_i$ for all i . We want to find a gradually varied function on D . However, f_J may not satisfy the condition of a gradually varied extension: i.e., for all p and p' in J , $d(p, p') \geq d(f_J(p), f_J(p'))$. In this section, we will design an algorithm for the optimal uniform approximation of f_J .

In the case of a gradually varied approximation, the uniform approximation is to find a gradually varied function f_D such that $Max\{d(f_D(p), f_J(p)) | p \in J\}$ is minimum; the least squares approximation is to find a gradually varied function f_D such that $\sum_{p \in J} (f_D(p) - f_J(p))^2$ is a minimum.

Obviously, the solutions of the above two problems always exist because of the finiteness of the points in D . The question is how to find an efficient algorithm to obtain the fitting.

This section will give a fast algorithm to solve the uniform approximation problem. For the least squares approximation, we have not solved the problem. It may be an NP -hard problem.

This paper is only concerned with the uniform approximation. Without loss of generality, we can assume for convenience that $A_s = s$. Also, we denote

$$(1) F_i(p) = \{f_J(p) \pm t | t = 0, 1, \dots, i\},$$

$$(2) F_i(p)/F_i(q) = \{x | x \in F_i(p) \text{ and there is } y \in F_i(q) \text{ such that } d(p, q) \geq d(x, y)\},$$

and

$$(3) F_i^k(p) = \cap_{q \in J} F_i^{k-1}(p)/F_i^{k-1}(q), \text{ where } F_i^0(p) = F_i(p).$$

Lemma 5.1. (1) For every p and k , $F_i^k(p) \subset F_i^{k-1}(p)$.

(2) If there exists a k , for all $p \in J$, $F_i^k(p) = F_i^{k+1}(p)$. Thus, for all $N > k$, $F_i^k(p) = F_i^N(p)$.

Proof

(1) is obvious.

(2) We might as well assume that $N = k+2$, $F_i^{k+2}(p) = \cap_{q \in J} F_i^{k+1}(p)/F_i^{k+1}(q) = \cap_{q \in J} \{x | x \in F_i^{k+1}(p) \& \exists y \in F_i^{k+1}(q) (d(p, q) \geq d(x, y))\} = \cap_{q \in J} \{x | x \in F_i^k(p) \& \exists y \in F_i^k(q) (d(p, q) \geq d(x, y))\} = \cap_{q \in J} F_i^k(p)/F_i^k(q) = F_i^{k+1}(p)$. \diamond

Theorem 5.1. If $\exists k \forall p \in J (F_i^{k+1}(p) = F_i^k(p) \neq \emptyset)$, then for every $p \in J$, let $g_J(p) = \inf\{F_i^k(p)\}$. Then, g_J satisfies that, for any $p, q \in J$, $d(p, q) \geq d(g_J(p), g_J(q))$ and $\forall p \in J (d(g_J(p), f(p)) \leq i)$. And vice versa.

Proof For necessity, let g_J satisfy the condition of gradual variation and

$$\max_{x \in J} \{d(g_J(x), f_J(x))\} = i.$$

Then, for any $p \in J$, we have

$$g_J(p) \in F_i(p)$$

and for any $q \in J$, there is $g_J(q) \in F_i(q)$ with $d(p, q) \geq d(g_J(q), g_J(p))$. So, $g_J(p) \in F_i(p)/F_i(q)$.

Thus, $g_J(p) \in \cap_{q \in J} F_i(p)/F_i(q)$, i.e., $g_J(p) \in F_i^{(1)}(p)$. Assume $g_J(p) \in F_i^{(k-1)}(p)$, then $g_J(p) \in F_i^{(k-1)}(p)/F_i^{(k-1)}(q)$, $\forall q \in J$. Hence, $g_J(p) \in F_i^{(k)}(p)$. Up to now we can conclude that for any $k > 0$, $F_i^k \neq \emptyset$. Because $F_i(p)$ is limited, there must be a k so that $\forall p \in J(F_i^{(k)}(p) = F_i^{(k+1)}(p))$.

For sufficientness, if there is a k , $\forall p \in J(F_i^{(k)}(p) = F_i^{(k+1)}(p) \neq \emptyset)$.

We will use mathematical induction method below. We first want to prove that if $x \in F_i^{(k)}(p) \& y \in F_i^{(k)}(p)$, where $x < y$, and if there is z with $x \leq z \leq y$, then $z \in F_i^{(k)}(p)$. According to the definition of $F_i(p) = F_i^0(p)$, this is true if $k = 0$. Assume the statement is valid when $k = t - 1$; we want to prove it is true when $k = t$.

Since $x, y \in F_i^t(p)$, then $x, y \in \cap_{q \in J} F_i^{t-1}(p)/F_i^{t-1}(q)$. So, for any $q \in J$, $x, y \in F_i^{t-1}(p)/F_i^{t-1}(q)$. That is to say, there are $\xi, \eta \in F_i^{t-1}(q)$ such that

$$d(p, q) \geq d(x, \xi) \text{ and } d(p, q) \geq d(y, \eta)$$

If $x \leq z \leq y$, we need to prove that one of the following arguments is true: (1) $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \xi)$, (2) $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \eta)$, or (3) there exists $w \in F_i^{t-1}(q)$ such that $d(z, w) = 0$.

(a) Assume $\eta < \xi$. If $y \geq \xi$, then $d(y, \eta) = d(y, \xi) + d(\eta, \xi)$. So, $d(p, q) \geq d(y, \xi)$ and $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \xi)$. If $y < \xi$, then $x < \xi$. So, $d(x, \xi) \geq d(z, \xi)$. Therefore, $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \xi)$.

(b) Assume $\xi < \eta$. If $\xi \geq z$, then $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \xi)$. Thus, $d(p, q) \geq d(z, \eta)$ if $\eta \leq Z$. Since $F_i^{t-1}(q)$ has all elements between ξ and η according to the induction

assumption if $\xi < z < \eta$, there must be an element $w = z$ in $F_i^{t-1}(q)$ such that $d(w, z) = 0$.

Therefore, $z \in F_i^{(t-1)}(p)/F_i^{(t-1)}(q)$. Since q is an arbitrary point in J , we have $z \in F_i^{(t)}(p)$. So, we have proven that the elements of $z \in F_i^{(k)}(p)$ are consecutive.

We know that there always exists a k such that $\forall p \in J (F_i^{(k)}(p) = F_i^{(k+1)}(p))$. For every $F_i^{(k)}(p) \neq \emptyset$, let $m(F_i^{(k)}(p))$ and $M(F_i^{(k)}(p))$ be the minimum and maximum elements, respectively.




Fig. 5.1. Two cases of $F_i^{(k)}(p)$ and $F_i^{(k)}(q)$.

If $d(p, q) < d(m(F_i^{(k)}(p)), m(F_i^{(k)}(q)))$, we might as well assume $m(F_i^{(k)}(p)) < m(F_i^{(k)}(q))$. See Fig. (5.1a)). For any $y \in F_i^{(k)}(q)$, we have $d(m(F_i^{(k)}(p)), y) \geq d(m(F_i^{(k)}(p)), m(F_i^{(k)}(q))) > d(p, q)$. This is a contradiction because $F_i^{(k)}(p) = F_i^{(k+1)}(p)$. Similarly, we can prove $m(F_i^{(k)}(p)) > m(F_i^{(k)}(q))$. See Fig. (5.1b)).

Therefore, for any p, q , we have $d(p, q) \geq d(m(F_i^{(k)}(p)), m(F_i^{(k)}(q)))$. So, let $g_J(p) = m(F_i^{(k)}(p))$ for all p , then g_J is the i th-gradually varied approximation.

◇

This theorem can be used to verify the envelope Theorem 4.1. According to Theorem 5.1, we can first compute g_J , then compute its gradually varied function.

6. FAST ALGORITHMS AND GRADUALLY VARIED EXTENSIONS

We will use a computer to generate fast algorithms [13] for gradually varied extensions. An algorithm for the uniform approximation is shown below:

Step 1 Initially, let $i = 1$, and compute $F_i(p)$, $F_i(p)/F_i(q)$, and $F_i^k(p)$.

Step 2 Check if the condition of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied. If not, $i \leftarrow i + 1$ and go to step 1.

Step 3 Let $g_J(p) = \inf\{F_i^k(p)\}$ for each $p \in J$.

Step 4 Find a gradually varied extension f_D of g_J .

A procedure for generating a gradually varied extension is given below:

Procedure A: Given a digital manifold D and its subset J , and given $f_J : J \rightarrow \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$, where $A_1 < \dots < A_m$, this procedure is to obtain a gradually varied function $f : D \rightarrow \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ or state that there is not any gradually varied function f for f_J .

BEGIN

FOR (every pair p, p' in D) DO

 compute $d(p, p')$ by Floyd's algorithm [6];

FOR (every pair p, p' in J) DO

 IF ($d(p, p') < d(f_J(p), f_J(p'))$) THEN {there is no f and halt;}

$D_0 := J$;

FOR (every $r \in D_0$) DO { $f(r) := f_J(r)$; }

5 IF ($D_0 = D$) THEN

 output f and halt;

ELSE

 BEGIN

 choose x in $D - D_0$ such that x has an adjacent point

$r \in D_0$. (without loss of generality assume $f(r) = A_i$);

```

END
 $f(x) := A_i$ ;
FOR (every  $p \in D_0$ ) DO
  BEGIN
    IF(  $d(x, p) < d(f(x), f(p))$  ) THEN
      IF (  $f(x) > f(p)$  ) THEN (  $f(x) := A_{i-1}$  ) ELSE (  $f(x) := A_{i+1}$ 
);
    END
     $D_0 := D_0 \cup \{x\}$ ;
    GOTO 5;
END

```

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by the Science Fund of the Chinese Academy of Sciences for Young Scientists. Many thanks to my friend Dr. Dave Mount, Specialist of Computational Geometry and Professor of Computer Science at University of Maryland, who has fully checked the correctness of the proof of Theorem 3.1, the most important result in this paper. He also removed an minor error in the proof.

Appendix: Discrete and Digital Manifolds

Basically, a discrete manifold means the discretization of a continuous manifold. For example, the simplex decomposition of a manifold is a discrete manifold. However, a manifold may have thousands of different discretizations. For computer scientists, it is important to define what a discrete manifold is; otherwise, there is no way to track or search a discrete manifold using computers. That is the major difference between a computer scientist and a mathematician. In other words, computer scientists always prefer to have definitive concepts and results because they want to use an algorithm to solve all problems. Mathematicians, on the other hand, are interested in the properties of a theory based on some assumptions.

The definition of a discrete manifold must not have non-reasonable contradictions to the continuous manifold. However, their differences are obvious, for example, a neighborhood of a point in a continuous manifold contains an infinite number of points, but a discrete manifold itself may only contain a finite number of points. There are many real discrete manifolds. For instance, the set Σ_m that contains all integer coordinate points of an m -dimensional Euclid space is a discrete manifold. We sometimes call this manifold a digital manifold. A simplex decomposition Δ_n of an n -dimensional manifold is also a discrete manifold.

Generally, a discrete manifold is a graph with some additional geometric and topological structures. However, the strict mathematical definition of discrete manifolds must not depend on continuous manifolds, because it is impossible to determine an infinite number of elements by an algorithm that uses a set of step actions.

In the early 1980s, researchers in the area of image processing attempted to discover the principal properties of digital surfaces in three dimensional digital space, i.e., Σ_3 [15], [16], [17]. Their motivation was to find fast tracking and recognition algorithms for digital surfaces in three-dimensional digital images, which is very useful for image processing and computer vision. Some definitions and properties

of digital surfaces can be found in Artzy, Frieder and Herman [16], Morgenthaler and Rosenfeld [17], and Chen and Zhang [18].

This paper will use the definition of discrete manifolds given by Chen [21], [22]. A graph, G , consists of two sets V and E . V is a set of vertices, and E is a set of pairs of vertices, called edges. An edge is said to be incident with the vertices it joins. We assume $G = (V, E)$ is an undirected graph in this paper. We also assume $G = (V, E)$ is a simple graph, meaning every pair of vertices has only one edge that is incident to these two vertices, and there is no $(a, a) \in E$ for any $a \in V$.

If (p, q) is in E , p is said to be adjacent to q . Let $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n$ be $n + 1$ vertices be in V . If (p_{i-1}, p_i) is in E for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n\}$ is called a path. If $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n$ are distinct vertices, the path is called a simple path. A simple path $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n\}$ is closed if (p_0, p_n) is an edge in E . A closed path is also called a cycle. Two vertices p and q are connected if there is a path $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n\}$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $p_n = q$. G is said to be connected if every pair of vertices in G is connected. We always assume G is connected in this paper.

Let S be a set. Assume S' is a subset of S , denoted by $S' \subseteq S$. If S is not a subset of S' , then S' is called a proper-subset of S , denoted by $S' \subset S$. Suppose $G' = (V', E')$ is a graph where $V' \subset V$ and $E' \subset E$ for graph $G = (V, E)$. We say $G' = (V', E')$ is a partial graph of G . If E' consists of all edges in G whose joining vertices are in V' , then the partial graph $G' = (V', E')$ is called a subgraph of G , denoted by $G' \preceq G$. If V' is a proper subset of V , then we denote $G' \prec G$. We note that for a certain subset V' of V , the subgraph G' with vertices V' is uniquely defined.

A.1 Basic Cells: Point-cells, Line-cells, and Surface-cells

Definition A.1 Each element of V is called a point-cell, 0-cell, or point. Each element of E is called a line-cell, or 1-cell.

Because G is simple and undirected, (a, b) , a line-cell or an element of E , can be

defined as the subset that contains two point-cells $\{a, b\}$. Intuitively, a surface-cell (2-cell) represents a certain area, such as a unit square. However, there is no “area” in a graph. So, a surface-cell can be defined as a closed path of points, p_0, \dots, p_n , where p_i and p_{i+1} are adjacent, or a path of edges, e_0, \dots, e_n , where e_i and e_{i+1} share a point. A path forms a partial graph of G .

In this paper, we assume that a surface-cell is not only a closed path (a partial graph), but also a subgraph. That is to say, the simple closed path has no proper partial graph in G that is a simple closed path. Because a subgraph is uniquely defined, we may use the set of vertices of the subgraph to represent the surface-cell. This matches our ideal, that is, any i -cells can be defined as a set of points.

According to the definition of subgraphs, if a subgraph D of G is a simple cycle, then D has no proper partial graph of itself that is a closed path. Such a D is also called a minimal cycle. A surface-cell must be a minimal cycle, but a minimal cycle may not be a surface-cell. A geometrical interpretation of G is needed to give a geometrical frame (a topological structure) to G .

Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all minimal cycles in G . Defining a subset of \mathcal{C} to be the set of surface-cells is a way to generate a geometrical frame for G .

Definition A.2 Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all minimal cycles in G . A subset of \mathcal{C} , denoted as U_2 , is called a surface-cell set if for any two different minimal cycles in U_2 , u and v , $u \cap v$ is connected in $u \cap v$.

Each of the elements of U_2 is called a surface-cell with respect to the pair $\langle G, U_2 \rangle$. In the above definition, if $u \cap v$ is empty, then u and v are not adjacent. We expect $u \cap v$ to be a connected path because we need the intersection of two surface-cells to be on the “edges” of these two surface-cells. If $u \cap v$ is just a node (point), we say u and v are point-connected. If $u \cap v$ has a line-cell, then u and v are said to be line-connected.

A.2 Discrete Curves and Surfaces

For a certain subset of vertices of G , a subgraph is unique. If G' is a partial

graph, $G(G')$ is the subgraph with all vertices in G' . For a subset of vertices of G , V' , we denote $G(V')$, the subgraph of G with all vertices in V' .

Definition A.2 A semi-curve D is either a simple path $P = \{p_0, \dots, p_n\}$ such that $G(P) = P$ if (p_0, p_n) is not an edge, or it is $G(P) = P \cup \{(p_0, p_n)\}$ if (p_0, p_n) is an edge in G .

We can view a semi-curve as a subset of vertices of G . It is true that a semi-curve is a subgraph D of G where each vertex has one or two adjacent vertices in D . In other words, a semi-curve D is a simple path p_0, \dots, p_n such that p_i and p_j are not adjacent in G if $i \neq j \pm 1$ except for $i = 0$ and $j = n$.

Definition A.3 For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a U_2 of G , $D \subset V$ is called a curve if D is a semi-curve and D does not contain any surface-cell in U_2 .

Note, we intentionally did not use $G(D)$ in Definition A.3 because they are equivalent. We can summarize the above definitions to be one for discrete curves: For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a U_2 of G , $D \subset V$ is said to be a discrete curve with respect to $\langle G, U_2 \rangle$ if (1) D is connected (0-connected, or point-connected), (2) each point (0-cell) is contained by one or two line-cells, and (3) D does not contain any surface-cell.

A common definition of curves is that “A simple discrete (or digital) curve is just a simple path in G .” (Rosenfeld and Kak’s book, [15].) It is a semi-curve in this paper. The reason is that there is a simple path that cannot separate the surface into two disconnected non-empty sets. This property is called the Jordan theorem, which holds for continuous space.

To determine the geometrical and topological structure of a graph G , selection of U_2 is a critical issue. In order to discuss the properties of all discrete spaces, we give a default definition of U_2 here. Unless specified otherwise, this default definition will apply.

Definition A.4 If G be a simple graph, the default definition of U_2 of G is :

- (1) Assume m is the minimum value of the lengths for all simple cycles. Then

all simple cycles with length m are surface-cells (i.e. in U_2).

(2) If a point p is not a point of any surface-cell in U_2 determined by (1), a minimum value of the simple cycle containing p will be included in U_2 .

After defining discrete curves, we now consider discrete surfaces.

Definition A.5 Subgraph D of G is a semi-surface if and only if each line-cell of D is included in one or two surface-cells in D . D is called a closed semi-surface if and only if each line-cell is included in exactly two surface-cells of D .

We also can view D in Definition A.5 as the vertex set of D because D is uniquely defined by its vertex set. In other words, we can use “vertex subset D ” as a substitute for “subgraph D ” in the definition. A 3-dimensional-cell (solid-cell or 3-cell) is a closed semi-surface, but a closed semi-surface may not be a 3-cell. Similarly, we can define discrete surfaces as follows: A closed semi-surface is called a minimal closed semi-surface if it does not contain any proper subset that is a closed semi-surface.

Definition A.6 Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all minimal closed semi-surfaces in G . A subset of \mathcal{S} , U_3 , is a 3-cell set if for any two different elements in U_3 , u and v , $u \cap v$ is (1) empty, (2) a vertex, (3) point-connected in $u \cap v$ if $u \cap v$ contains line-cells, or (4) line-connected in $u \cap v$ if $u \cap v$ contains surface-cells.

In most cases, $u \cap v$ is a point (0-cell), a line-cell, or a surface-cell. Each of the elements of U_3 is a 3-cell with respect to $\langle G, U_2, U_3 \rangle$.

Definition A.7 Subset S of G is a discrete surface with respect to $\langle G, U_2, U_3 \rangle$ if and only if S is a semi-surface and S does not contain any subset that is a 3-cell.

Definition A.8 The boundary of surface S , denoted by ∂S , is a subset of S such that if $b \in \partial S$, then there is a line-cell B containing b contained by exactly one surface-cell in S .

Corollary A.1 A discrete surface is closed if and only if $\partial S = \emptyset$.

A.3 Regular Surface Points

If S is a subset of G , assume $S(p)$ contains all points of all surface-cells containing

p in S .

Definition A.9 A point p in a discrete surface S is regular if the set of all surface-cells containing p are line-connected among these surface-cells. If a point in S is not regular, it is called irregular.

We may generalize the above definition. For any $\langle G = (V, E), U_2, U_3 \rangle$, a point $p \in V$ is said to be a regular surface point if $S(p)$ (meaning the subgraph generated by $S(p)$ with all line- and surface-cells) is a surface and all surface-cells in $S(p)$ are line-connected.

Lemma A.5 Let S be a discrete surface and a point $p \in S$. If p has only two adjacent points p', p'' in S , then there are two surface-cells A, B such that $A \cap B$ contains p', p, p'' . If p', p'' are adjacent in S , then p', p, p'' form a surface-cell.

Lemma A.6 Let S be a discrete surface. If p is an inner and regular point of S , then there exists a simple cycle containing all points in $S(p) - \{p\}$ in S .

Definition A.10 Let S be a discrete surface. Then p is said to be a simple surface point if $S(p) - p$ is a closed curve.

A regular inner point is a simple surface point in digital space Σ_m . For a digital surface S in Σ_3 , a simple surface point under Morgenthaler-Rosenfeld's definition is a regular inner surface point in the case of direct adjacency. (Chen *et al* 1999)

A.4 Discrete k -Manifolds

Definition A.11 A k -dimensional semi-manifold S is a set of k -cells in $\langle G = (V, E), U_2, \dots, U_k \rangle$ satisfying: (1) S is $(k - 1)$ -connected in S , and (2) each $(k - 1)$ -cell in S is contained by one or two k -cells.

Definition A.12 A closed k -dimensional semi-manifold (k -semi-manifold) S is called minimal if there is no proper subset of S that is a closed k -semi-manifold. A $(k + 1)$ -cell set, U_{k+1} , is a subset of all closed minimal k -semi-manifolds of G , such that for any pair of $u, v \in U_{k+1}$, $u \cap v$ is empty, a 0-cell, an unclosed 1-semi-manifold, ..., or an unclosed k -semi-manifold.

In Definition A.12, $u \cap v$ can be empty, a 0-cell, a 1-cell, ..., or a k -cell.

Definition A.13 A k -semi-manifold S is said to be a k -manifold if S does not contain any $k + 1$ -cell with respect to $\langle G, U_2, \dots, U_{k+1} \rangle$.

In other words, a k -manifold S is a set of k -cells in $\langle G = (V, E), U_2, \dots, U_{k+1} \rangle$ satisfying: (1) S is $(k - 1)$ -connected in S , (2) each $k - 1$ -cell in S is contained by one or two k -cells, and (3) S does not contain any $(k + 1)$ -cell.

That is to say, an n -cell set, U_n , can be defined by using existing $U_0 = V, U_1 = E, \dots, U_{n-1}$ of G . We also call U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n an n -dimensional discrete topological structure (DTS). We can see that if $U_i = \phi$ then $U_n = \phi$ for all $n > i$. The dimension of G is defined as the largest index of $U_n \neq \phi$ for all possible selections of DTS. Two k -cells, u and v , are i -adjacent if $u \cap v$ consists of several i -cells; and u and v are i -connected if there is a path u_1, \dots, u_m where u_t, u_{t+1} are i -adjacent, $t = 1, \dots, m - 1$, such that $u = u_1$ and $v = u_m$.

We have discussed the structure of a discrete k -manifold. A definition based on a 0-cell (point) can be defined as follows:

Definition A.14 Given an n -dimensional discrete-topological-structure of G , $\langle G = (V, E), U_2, \dots, U_n \rangle$, a connected subset M of $V(G)$ is said to be a discrete k -manifold, $k = 0, \dots, n$, if for any $a \in M$ then there exists a $u_i \in U_i, i = 1, \dots, k + 1, V(u_i) \subset M, i = 0, \dots, k + 1$, which satisfies: (1) any two k -cells are $(k - 1)$ -connected in M , (2) every $(k - 1)$ -cell in M is contained by only one or two k -cells, and (3) M does not contain any $(k + 1)$ -cell.

A discrete n -manifold can be defined in $\langle G, \dots, U_n \rangle$ by ignoring $(n + 1)$ -cell testing.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Chen (1990), "The necessary and sufficient condition and the efficient algorithms for gradually varied fill," *Chinese Science Bulletin*, Vol 35,10(1990). *Abstracts of SIAM Conference on Geometric design*, Tempe, AZ, 1989.
- [2] L. Chen (1991), "The properties and the algorithms for gradually varied fill," *Chinese J. of*

- Computers, Vol 14, 3.
- [3] L. Chen (1992), "Random gradually varied surface fitting," *Chinese Science Bulletin*, Vol. 37, 1992. *Abstracts of Second SIAM Conference on Geometric design*, Tempe, AZ, 1991.
 - [4] L. Chen (1991) "Gradually varied surfaces on digital manifold," *Abstracts of Second International Conference on Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, Washington, DC, 1991.
 - [5] A. Rosenfeld (1986), " 'Continuous' functions on digital pictures, " *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol 4, 177-184, 1986.
 - [6] Z. Pawlak (1999), "Rough sets, rough functions and rough calculus," in S.K. Pal and A. Skowron ed, *Rough Fuzzy Hybridization*, Springer-Verlag, 99-109, 1999.
 - [7] L. Chen "Three-dimensional fuzzy digital topology and its applications(I)," *Geophysical Prospecting for petroleum*, Vol 24, No 2, pp 86-89, 1985.
 - [8] L. Chen (1991), "The lambda-connected segmentation and the optimal algorithm for split-and-merge segmentation," *Chinese J. Computers* Vol 14, pp 321-331.
 - [9] L. Chen, H.D. Cheng, and J. Zhang (1994), " Fuzzy subfiber and its application to seismic lithology classification," *Information Science: Applications*, Vol 1, No 2, pp 77-95.
 - [10] L. Chen, O. Adjei, and D.H. Cooley, (2000) " λ -Connectedness : Method and Application," Proceedings of IEEE conference on System, Man, and Cybernetics 2000, pp 1157-1562.
 - [11] F. Harary (1972) *Graph Theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1972.
 - [12] T. H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, and R. L. Rivest (1993), *Introduction to Algorithms*, MIT Press, 1993.
 - [13] A. Aho, J. E. Hopcroft, and J. D. Ullman (1974) *The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1974.
 - [14] E. Bishop and D. Bridges (1985) *Constructive Analysis*, Springer Verlag, 1985.
 - [15] A. Rosenfeld and A. Kak (1982) *Digital Picture Processing*, Vol. I and II, Academic Press, Orlando, 1982.
 - [16] E. Artzy, G. Frieder and G. T. Herman, (1981) "The theory, design, implementation and evaluation of a three-dimensional surface detection algorithm", *Comput. Vision Graphics Image Process.* Vol 15 , pp. 1-24.
 - [17] D. G. Morgenthaler and A. Rosenfeld(1982) "Surfaces in three-dimensional images", *Information. and Control* Vol 51, pp. 227-247, 1982.
 - [18] L. Chen and J. Zhang (1993), "Digital manifolds: A Intuitive Definition and Some Properties", *The Proc. of the Second ACM/SIGGRAPH Symposium on Solid Modeling and Applications*, pp. 459-460, Montreal, 1993.

- [19] L. Chen, D.H. Cooley, and L. Zhang (1998), "An Intelligent data fitting technique for 3D velocity reconstruction, Application and Science of Computational Intelligence," Proc SPIE Vol 3390, 1998.
- [20] L. Chen, H. Cooley and J. Zhang (1999), "The equivalence between two definitions of digital surfaces," *Information Sciences*, Vol 115, pp 201-220, 1999.
- [21] L. Chen (1997), Generalized discrete object tracking algorithms and implementations, Vision Geometry VI, Proc. SPIE Vol. 3168.
- [22] L. Chen(1999), Note on the discrete Jordan curve theorem, Vision Geometry VIII, Proc. SPIE Vol. 3811, 1999.