

COLORME: COvariance-based ℓ_0 super-Resolution Microscopy with intensity Estimation



V. Stergiopoulou,¹ J. H. de M. Goulart,² S. Schaub,³ L. Calatroni,¹ L. Blanc-Féraud¹

Point Spread Function (PSF)

- 1 : Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, INRIA, I3S Laboraptory, France
- 2 : IRIT, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse INP, Toulouse, France
- 3 : Sorbonne Université, CNRS, IMEV, France

1. Conventional Fluorescent Microscopy Limitations

Fluorescence microscopy is an imaging technique that allows the investigation of living cells and their organelles.





Smallest resolvable distance (Rayleigh Criterion): $d = \frac{0.61\lambda}{M}$ λ : emission wavelength, NA: Numerical Aperture.

 $(d \approx 200 nm)$

Resolvable and non-resolvable line profiles

2. Super-Resolution in Fluorescence Microscopy

Many super-resolution techniques have been proposed since the 1990's to overcome the "diffraction barrier": STimulated Emission Depletion (STED), Single Molecule Localization Microscopy (SMLM), Structured Illumination Microscopy (SIM), ...

Several among them (e.g., STED and SIM) need special acquisition equipment.

SMLM requires specific photoactivable fluorophores and is very time consuming (as it relies on the acquisition of a large set of sparse images).

Exploiting temporal diversity

In this work, we focus on a less constraining approach: acquiring a temporal sequence of images over a short time interval and exploit the temporal diversity induced by the independent random blinking of individual fluorophores: a principle followed by e.g. the SOFI¹, SRRF² and SPARCOM³ methods.



3. Mathematical Modeling

The discrete model describing the acquisition process at frame $t, t \in \{1, ..., T\}$ is given by:

 $\mathbf{Y}_{t} = M_{q}(H(\mathbf{X}_{t})) + \mathbf{N}_{t} + \mathbf{B}, \ \mathbf{Y}_{t} = \mathbf{\Psi}\mathbf{x}_{t} + \mathbf{n}_{t} + \mathbf{b}, \ \mathbf{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^{2} \times L^{2}}$

• $\mathbf{Y}_{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$: LR acquisition



• $M_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N imes L}$: down-sampling operator



{vasiliki.stergiopoulou, calatroni, blancf} @i3s.unice.fr henrique.goulart@irit.fr sebastien.schaub@imev-mer.fr

4. COLORME: Support and Intensity Estimation

Steps:

• Estimate $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}$ from which we deduce the support of \mathbf{x} denoted by $\Omega_{\mathbf{x}} = \{i : \mathbf{x}_i \neq 0\} \subset \{1, \dots, L^2\}$ as $\Omega_{\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}} = \Omega_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Idea: Enforce sparsity on $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L^2}$.

We consider the continuous relaxation of the ℓ_2 - ℓ_0 problem⁴:

$$\begin{aligned} &\arg\min_{\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}\geq 0,s\geq 0} \ \mathcal{G}_{\text{CELO}} := \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{y}} - (\mathbf{\Psi}\odot\mathbf{\Psi})\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}} - s\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{v}}\|_{2}^{2} + \Phi_{\text{CELO}}(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}};\lambda) \\ &\text{where, defining } \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}} := (\mathbf{\Psi}\odot\mathbf{\Psi})_{\mathbf{i}} \text{ as the } i\text{-th column of the operator } \mathbf{\Psi}\odot\mathbf{\Psi} \\ &\Phi_{\text{CELO}}(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}};\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^{L^{2}} \phi_{\text{CELO}}((\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}})_{i}; \|\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}}\|, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{L^{2}} \lambda - \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}}\|^{2}}{2} \left(|(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}})_{i}| - \frac{\sqrt{2\lambda}}{\|\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}}\|} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}})_{i}| < \frac{\sqrt{2\lambda}}{2} \right\}}, \end{aligned}$$

Algorithmically: G_{CELO} is non-convex, **but** it is continuous \rightarrow available iterative solvers!

• We then estimate the intensity of **x** only on its support, and at the same time the spatially constant background $\mathbf{b} = b\mathbf{1}_{M^2}, b \ge 0$, by solving:

$$\arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{|\Omega|}_+,\ b\in\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{1}{2}\|\overline{\mathbf{y}}-\mathbf{\Psi}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}\mathbf{x}-b\mathbf{1}_{M^2}\|_2^2+\alpha\|\nabla\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$$

where the i-th column of $\Psi_{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{M^2 imes |\Omega|}$ is extracted from Ψ for all indices $i \in \Omega$.

To the best of our knowledge, COLORME is the only super-resolution method exploiting temporal fluctuations which is capable of retrieving real intensity and background information.

5. Results and Discussion

Simutalted Data

Experimental Data

- Spatial distribution (8731 fluorophores) from SMLM challenge[‡] 2016.
- Temporal profiles generated with SOFI simulation tool.⁵
- Emitter density is equal to 10.7 emitters/pixel/frame
- Fine-grid pixel size = 25 nm, PSF FWHM \approx 229 nm.
- T = 700, N = 40, q = 4, acq. time ≈ 7 s
- Background: 2500 photons/pixel/frame, Gaussian noise of 20dB



Fig. 1: Results for the simulated 'High Background' dataset: (a) temporal average of the acquired stack ($4 \times$ zoom). (b) ground truth, (c) COLORME. (d) SRRF, (e) SPARCOM, (f) intensity profiles (SRRF and SPARCOM with adapted range as they do not actually estimate real signal intensities)

COLORME PSNR value: 28.37dB and background estimation 2454 photons/pixel/frame

- $H \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$: convolution operator
- N_t: additive white Gaussian noise
- B: spatially and temporally constant background



Acknowledgements

The work of VS and LBF has been supported by the French government, through the 3IA Côte d'AzurInvestments in the Future project managed by the National Research Agency (ANR) with the reference number ANR-19-P3IA-0002. LC acknowledges the support received by UCA IDEX JEDI and by the NoMADS RISE H2020 project 777826.

 \star : The \odot symbol stand for the column-wise Kronecker product.

- A real dataset from the SMLM challenge 2013.
- We can apply these methods on high-density acquisitions obtained by SMLM techniques (the temporal behaviour of one pixel in high density videos looks like "blinking")
- Fine-grid pixel size = 25 nm, PSF FWHM \approx 352 nm.
- T = 500, N = 40, q = 4, acq. time ≈ 20 s



Fig. 2: Results on high-density SMLM data: (a) summation of the acquired stack ($4 \times$ zoom), (b) COLORME, (c) SRRF

Despite the high-density and short sequence, all the methods find a good reconstructed image. We observe that SRRF preserves better the broad structure of the specimen, while COL0RME better separates very close tubulins and does not create any background artifacts.

References

- 1. T.Dertinger, R.Colyer, G.lyer et al., Proc. National Academy of Sciences, 106 52, 2009.
- 2. N.Gustafsson, S.Culley, G.Ashdown et al., Nature Communications, 7, 2016
- 3. O.Solomon, Y.C.Eldar, M. Mutzafi et al. SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 12 1, 2019.
- 4. E.Soubies, L.Blanc-Féraud and G.Aubert, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 8 3, 2015.
- 5. A.Girsault, T. Lukes, A. Sharipov et al., PLoS ONE, 11 9, 2016.
- t: http://bigwww.epfl.ch/smlm/datasets/index.html