

Perceptual Grouping and Directionality Determination Using an Electromagnetic Model

Thierry Pun

Michel Regamey

Philippe Narbel

Computing Science Center, University of Geneva
12, rue du Lac, CH-1207 Geneva Switzerland
Tel: +41(22) 787 65 82, e-mail: pun@cui.unige.ch

Juan Mosig

Laboratory of Electromagnetism and Acoustics
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
CH-1015 Ecublens Switzerland

Abstract

A computational model is presented for determining the directionality of image primitives. Using simple electromagnetic concepts, this model allows grouping of tokens along the perceived underlying direction. Assumptions used in the approach are that grouping is a low-level, data-driven and global process, with all image tokens interacting in some way.

Prominent image features are considered as being electrical charges. According to Poisson's equation, they generate a scalar potential and an associated "electrical" vector field. This field, determined by the combined global influence of all image features, is well defined over the entire image. Its local direction allows grouping of primitives according to their common directional tendency.

Implementation problems and solutions are summarized; results using abstract images are presented and discussed. In particular, it is shown how grouping based on directionality differs from nearest-neighbor grouping.

Keywords: low-level vision, perceptual grouping, directionality, electromagnetic model, Poisson equation, Laplace field.

1. Introduction

Low-level vision aims at extracting primitives as significant as possible out of an observed scene, using mostly or only bottom-up mechanisms. Following [Zuc83], grouping is used as a generic term for a set of processes that construct more abstract entities out of more primitive ones. Such processes are crucial in analyzing visual inputs; they start at an early stage and occur recursively at different levels.

The proposed approach to grouping relies on a directionally selective mechanism. Primitive tokens are linked according to a measure of their common directional tendency. Concepts from electromagnetic theory, namely electrical potential and field, allow definition of such a measure.

In section 1 are introduced low-level perceptual grouping (§1.1.), directionality and proximity (§1.2.); reasons for determining directionality are exposed (§1.3.). Basic motivations for the electromagnetic approach are then given in section 2; they lead to a very simple computational model for which implementation problems and solutions are summarized. In section 3, results using abstract images are presented and discussed.

1.1. Low-level Perceptual Grouping

Even when looking at images composed only of very simple 0D or 1D tokens (dots, segments), there is clear evidence that the human visual system accomplishes more than simply contrast detection. Global groupings that are perceived in such circumstances have been extensively reported. Psychologists from the Gestalt school are famous in this respect [Wer23] [Pom77]; they theorize on the spontaneous appearance of a "good shape" from seemingly unconnected tokens. This is often reported as "emergent features effect", "configural superiority", "the whole is more than the sum of its parts" (holism), etc.

Although the Gestaltists show convincing evidence of the phenomenon, little is said about its nature. Attempts at modeling the reciprocal influence of patterns by a diffusion process [Koh20], or brain potentials and DC currents [Koh44] did not

go very far. Neurophysiological research has made the hypothesis of direct current flows highly unlikely [Bec82], although magnetic fields and oscillatory mechanisms are known to exist in the cortex [Kau84] [Sch90] [Bur91]. Nevertheless, such Gestalt physics and the quest for physical properties yielding order and regularity have influenced many a computer vision researcher.

Grouping is a form of perceptual organization. Studies aiming at explaining perceptual organization have been conducted from various points of view. The information theoretic approach [Att54] [Lee71] [Res82] considers good figures as those having a rather regular, predictable shape, hence minimizing some form of information measure. The transformational invariance approach [Pal83] defines these good figures as being the most stable, that is the most invariant to geometrical transformations. Grouping occurs through parallel evaluation of these invariances over many stimuli: grouped primitives are those related by little or no transformation. Another approach relying on geometric groups properties puts emphasis on how local processes in the visual system work cooperatively to produce global phenomena of perception [Hof85]; the Lie transformation group is used as a model [Dod83]. All these approaches offer interesting and relevant notions; not much however is given in computational terms.

Different researchers have dealt with the extraction of regional or global characteristics out of images composed of distributed, local tokens; noted examples are detailed in [Gla69] [Ste78] [Kas85]. Often however these characteristics are global properties, such as orientation, rather than explicit groupings. Grouping there is not seen as the fundamental problem, but rather as a consequence, deriving from the results.

Other approaches are more directly related to perceptual grouping. In [Low82], statistical distributions of features are computed, such as local orientation; non-parametric tests yield significant image relations. Texture segmentation, where emergent features play an important role, has also been related to grouping problems [Jul83] [Bec83]. Finally, Grossberg et al (e.g. [Gro88]) propose an approach based on a cooperative/competitive hierarchy of receptors; all their models have a strong physiological flavor.

In [Zuc83] are defined Type I and Type II groupings. In essence, Type I processes are one-dimensional and have well-defined spatial supports [Zuc85]. Type II groupings operate on Type II processes, that is dense families of implicit contours. The present approach combines characteristics from both Type I and II groupings. In particular, although the percept is essentially two-dimensional, grouping is characterized by high positional and orientational change specificity. Also, the present model does not particularly attempt at satisfying physiological constraints. The emphasis is on how perceptual grouping can be computationally modeled in a simple, effective manner.

1.2. Directionality and Proximity

Directionality refers to the global feeling of an underlying direction that some patterns give (Fig.1): circular Moiré patterns [Gla69], hairs [Zuc83], dot patterns, etc. The sensation is global, since it disappears upon examination of a restricted portion only of the image. It is robust to perturbations, since major changes do not necessarily affect the feeling.

Patterns such as those shown in Fig.1 somehow give the impression of a "flow" of particles, linear for Fig.1.a and circular for Fig.1.b. This analogy with a flow is however misleading, since in the present case everything is static. The matter of interest here is therefore not the extraction of the velocity vector associated with each token, but the determination of the underlying direction(s) that emerges upon examination of the image.

Directionality grouping is meant as the process of joining tokens in order to compose groups that lie along the *perceived* emergent direction. The *supports of the local direction vectors* are defined as the line segments linking pairs of grouped tokens. Despite the globality of the overall percept, this grouping process has a well defined local behavior: groups of tokens presenting small orientational differences with the overall direction are easily perceived.




Fig.1: dot patterns with strong directionality sensation; a) direction at approximately 45°, 60x60 pixels; b) Moiré pattern, 64x64 pixels. See §3.1 for a more detailed description.

In the process of grouping tokens, spatial *proximity* also plays an important role. The first tokens to be grouped, with or without directional information, are the closest ones. Amongst the Gestalt principles [Wer23], proximity is certainly the first to operate. It is obvious in any grouping, at any level of complexity. It is an underlying paradigm for both cooperative and competitive mechanisms, since they both deal on tokens that are close together.

Directionality as well as proximity can be simply and efficiently computed using the proposed electromagnetic framework: whereas the electrical field allows determination of directional information, the electrical potential provides means of inferring proximity relationships.

The assumptions underlying the computational model presented here are that:

- grouping is a low-level, data-driven mechanism;
- grouping is a global process, where all image tokens interact in some way; the closer they are, the more they do so. Globality yields insensitivity to most small perturbations; this is in accordance with the very qualitative nature of the human visual system;
- the global measures on which the grouping process is based are well defined locally over the entire discrete image. Possibility of a local definition is necessary, since certain minute pattern variations have very significant effects.

1.3. Motivations for Determining Directionality

Directionality provides means of defining a *functional grouping*, which links together tokens having similar "behavior"; this is reminiscent of the Gestalt "Law of common destiny" [Wer23]. After linkage, patterns thus constituted can be fed to a higher-level process of a computer vision system. Furthermore, tokens which show a different behavior are located. These are of importance in a vision system, for example by offering a means of directing a focus of attention mechanism.

Inferring directional information is useful in itself, since it provides a valuable characterization of image properties. In particular, the present approach yields the supports of the local direction vectors.

The directional grouping approach cannot deal with effects such as similarity, or symmetry. It seems plausible that *hierarchical grouping* will have to be used in order to solve these issues (if it is postulated that they are the result of bottom-up processes). The first two levels could be based upon proximity and directionality. Similarity, then symmetry, could be computed by more involved grouping stages, on the basis of techniques such as transformational measures [Pal83] [Ead88] [Yue90].

2. Electromagnetic Model

2.1. Motivations

The primary motivation for the electromagnetic approach is related with the globality of perceptual grouping. To capture such property calls for some global modeling of interactions between all elements in a given image region. This is precisely what is accomplished by a potential and its associated vector field: each token is subject to the combined influence of all others. There is no need to define size or orientation of some operators; the effect of each element is implicitly taken into account.

Another motivation is that although potential and field have global influences, they are well defined locally. This allows integration of local, proximity based processes, to coherent global operations. As argued in Section 1.2. both these aspects, global and local, are necessary for directional grouping. They are inherent to the present approach.

The type of solutions for potential and field that the present model yields (e.g. equipotentials, field lines, potential surfaces; see §2.3.) verify a minimum energy principle. This is in accordance with the soap bubble paradigm [Att82] [Wit83], which calls for perception of as much regularity as data allows. Minimum properties are of interest because grouping certainly relies on regularity.

The electromagnetic approach is not a visual process theory, in the sense that there is no implication that the human visual system follows the same principles. It provides however an elegant formalism to model how local processes work cooperatively to produce global phenomena of perception.

Section 2.2. discusses the electromagnetic model for directionality determination and grouping (some basic notions of electromagnetism are recalled in Appendix). Section 2.3. discusses electromagnetism for proximity grouping.

2.2. Electromagnetism as a Model for Directional Grouping

2.2.a. Image features modeled as electrical charges

Each important image feature, called below *generating feature*, generates an electrical field and consequently a scalar potential. Two electromagnetic analogues for these generating features can be considered: either electrical conductors at a given potential [Pun89], or space charges (as described here).

The image is denoted $I(x, y)$, where I is the luminance at point (x, y) . A simple situation can be first considered, where the image is composed only of a series of N dots at positions (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1..N$ (Fig.2). Each dot is modeled by one space charge whose value depends on $I(x_i, y_i)$. For the sake of simplicity, q is chosen proportional to I (with the normalizing constant k):

$$q_i = f[I(x_i, y_i)] = k \cdot I(x_i, y_i) \quad i = 1..N \quad \text{Eq.1}$$

Hence, following Eq.15 and Eq.16 (Appendix), Eq.2 and Eq.3 allow direct computation of the potential $V(x,y)$ and the electrical field $\vec{E}(x,y)$ at each point:

$$V(\vec{r}) = k \cdot \sum_i \frac{I(x_i, y_i)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|} = k \cdot \sum_i \frac{I(x_i, y_i)}{\sqrt{(x-x_i)^2 + (y-y_i)^2}} \quad \text{Eq.2}$$

and

$$\vec{E}(\vec{r}) = k \cdot \sum_i l(x_i, y_i) \frac{\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|^3} \quad \text{Eq.3}$$

where \vec{r} , \vec{r}_i and $|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|$ respectively correspond to the position (x, y) of the point where $V(x, y)$ and $\vec{E}(x, y)$ are to be determined, the position of charge i , and the distance between the point and the charge i , all in a common absolute coordinates system.




Fig.2: Image features modeled as electrical charges. They produce a scalar potential as well as an electrical vector field in the image plane.

According to electromagnetic theory however, the electrical field is not defined on a charge (c.f. Eq.3). For reasons mentioned below (§2.2.b.), the present model requires the ability of defining a pseudo-field \vec{E} at the token locations. This pseudo-field is determined by adding the contributions of every charge but the one positioned at the token location:

$$\vec{E}(\vec{r}_j) = k \cdot \sum_{i \neq j} l(x_i, y_i) \frac{\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|^3} \quad \text{Eq.4}$$

Using Eq.4 rather than Eq.3 combines both global (sum Σ) and localized ($i \neq j$) behaviors. In this way, \vec{E} is well defined over the entire discrete image.

By generalizing the somehow artificial case of dot patterns, more complex grey-level images could possibly be treated. The following problem has however to be dealt with. With the present synthetic images, dots (tokens) are assimilated to charges and generate a Laplacian field; this field is assumed to carry the underlying structural information contained in the image. The trouble with real images is that there is no guarantee that the grey-levels that carry the pictorial information will follow a smoothly varying function, more precisely a function with zero Laplacian (Laplacian field). How then could the present model be used, since it makes the assumption that underlying features satisfy the Laplace equation?

What ought to be done is to assume that the Laplace equation is locally satisfied, i.e. that the image is locally smooth. The generating features should then be positioned at locations where

the image changes from one smooth patch to another; they would therefore correspond to points on object contours. Their associated charge could be the luminance of the *original* image, at the contour location. Some experiments along this line have been presented in [Pun89], although making use only of the potential V (proximity grouping).

In summary, generating features such as points or contours are represented by dots. Each such dot generates a field; the global solution is obtained by superimposition of all individual effects.

2.2.b. Supports of the direction vectors and directionality grouping

Directionality grouping is the process of joining tokens in order to compose groups lying along the perceived direction. Actually, it is the line segments linking pairs of grouped tokens that will define the supports of the local direction vectors. Fig.3 shows 4 charges, with \vec{E} computed using Eq.4. Such 4-point patterns appear at various locations in the test images and are representative of a frequently occurring situation. In order to obtain directional rather than nearest-neighbor grouping, token (charge) q_1 should be grouped with q_2 rather than q_3 , although q_3 is the closest (q_3 should be grouped with q_4 rather than q_1).

In computational terms, this corresponds to grouping charges with the *most similar* electrical fields \vec{E} , in direction and orientation. \vec{E}_1 and \vec{E}_2 are the most similar, therefore tokens q_1 and q_2 , rather than q_1 and q_3 , will be grouped. The supports of the local direction vectors are the lines q_1 - q_2 and q_3 - q_4 .

Fig.3 illustrates two important points:

- directionality grouping is *different* from proximity grouping: the latter would join q_1 with q_3 , q_2 with q_4 ;
- the supports of the local direction vectors are *not* colinear with the direction of the local field \vec{E} . The \vec{E} field direction corresponds to the gradient of the local potential function; this is not the case with these local direction vectors.




Fig.3: 4 image tokens q_1 , q_2 , q_3 , q_4 ; electrical fields \vec{E}_1 , \vec{E}_2 , \vec{E}_3 , \vec{E}_4 (Eq.4). The dotted lines are the supports of the local direction vectors.

2.2.c. Scale and similarity

Pairs of tokens that will be grouped are those for which the \vec{E} field directions are the most similar. The measure of *similarity* s between two charges is defined as the normalized scalar product of the field directions:

$$s(q_i, q_j) = \frac{\vec{E}_i \cdot \vec{E}_j}{\|\vec{E}_i\| \cdot \|\vec{E}_j\|} = \cos(\vec{E}_i, \vec{E}_j) \quad \text{Eq.5}$$

The similarity varies between -1 and +1. A perfect match is indicated by +1; opposite and orthogonal directions are respectively -1 and 0.

The *scale of observation* also needs to be selected; this is actually the only parameter that is required. Tokens q_i and q_j are grouped only if they are closer than a given distance d_{\max} :

$$\|\vec{r}(q_i) - \vec{r}(q_j)\| \leq d_{\max} \quad \text{Eq.6}$$

2.3. Electromagnetism as a Model for Proximity Grouping

The previous section 2.2. presented electromagnetism as a model for directional grouping. Electromagnetism can also be used for proximity grouping, that is joining tokens on the basis of their proximity. General principles of the approach are recalled here; more details can be found in [Pun89].

The potential $V(x,y)$ needs first to be determined over the entire image (Eq.2). Then, for each constant potential value V_{eqp} in the dynamic range $[\min(V) \dots \max(V)]$, there exists at least one equipotential curve defined by:

$$V(x, y) = V_{\text{eqp}} \quad \text{Eq.7}$$

The equipotentials are closed; depending on V_{eqp} , they surround more or less image elements. These surrounded image tokens are those that are grouped.

Field lines are curves that are in each point tangent to \vec{E} : they are therefore orthogonal to equipotentials. In the cartesian referential (x,y) , each element (dx,dy) of a field line verifies:

$$\frac{dx}{E_x} = \frac{dy}{E_y} \quad \text{Eq.8}$$

Since field lines are normal to equipotentials, they can be seen as links between the tokens (generating features), as well as between the equipotentials. They can therefore be used to indicate which group of primitives is to be related to which other.

3. Implementation, Results and Discussion

Dot patterns have been chosen as test images in order to circumvent other issues, such as contours finding. The methodological choice of using abstract images has already been ex-

tensively addressed (e.g. [Zuc83] [Ull84]). Section 3.1. below presents implementation and details results. Section 3.2. discusses important features of the approach.

3.1. Implementation and Results

Two of the images used for the experiments are shown in Fig.1. In Fig.1.a, which is similar to Fig.8 in [Zuc83], there is an overall direction at approximately 45 degrees. Fig.1.b, inspired by [Gla69] or Fig.3 in [Zuc83], consists in the superimposition of a random field comprising approximately 150 dots with a rotated version of itself (angle 4 degrees). The Moiré figure thus constituted gives a strong circular feeling, that is to say that the local direction vectors lie along circles.

Values of tokens are arbitrarily set at 255, the background being 0. \vec{E} at each location is computed from Eq.4. Tokens groups, that define the supports of the direction vectors as well, are built by pairing dots that have the most similar \vec{E} directions (Eq.5) and are closer than a fixed d_{\max} (Eq.6).

Fig.4 presents the result of directional grouping on Fig.1 patterns. Situations similar to the one schematically depicted in Fig.3 appear at various places: dots that are linked together are not necessarily the closest ones. For the sake of comparison, Fig.5 shows the result of grouping dots on the basis of proximity, i.e. by linking nearest neighbors as long as their distance does not exceed a limit (also denoted d_{\max}). Results are clearly different. In Fig.5, as opposed to Fig.4, the line segments do not match well with the perceived directional sensation.

Fig.4.a and Fig.5.a have been quantitatively compared by analyzing the distribution of line segments orientations. For Fig.4.a, the average and mode of this distribution are at 45 degrees; 73% of the segments have the "correct" 45° angle, 84% have an orientation of 45° +/- 18°. This corresponds very well with the overall direction sensation. By contrast, for Fig.5.a, there are 3 almost equal modes at 0°, 45° and 90°; only 30% of the angles are 45°. The latter result is much less in accordance with the overall direction.

The difference between Fig.4.b and Fig.5.b is much more difficult to quantify. Qualitative differences are however easily perceived, as in the lower-left part of the image, or more generally on the outside of the circular Moiré. Directional grouping yields segments consistently tangential to the "circles", therefore well in accordance with the perceived circular pattern.

Fig.6 is a drawing of the normalized vectors \vec{E} at each dot location. This figure clearly illustrates the fact that the electrical field vectors are not parallel to the local direction vectors. They are not orthogonal either: there is no obvious systematic relationship between them. What is achieved is functional grouping, that is pairing tokens that share similar behaviors.




Fig.4: directional grouping: a) on Fig.1.a ($d_{max} = 3$): average and mode of the distribution are 45° (84% have an orientation of $45^\circ \pm 18^\circ$); b) on Fig.1.b ($d_{max} = 4$). Line segments indicate token pairs as well as supports of local direction vectors. These vectors correspond well with the underlying global direction.




Fig.5: proximity grouping: a) on Fig.1.a ($d_{max} = 3$): 30% of the segments have the 45° angle; b) on Fig.1.b ($d_{max} = 4$). Values of d_{max} are the same as those used in Fig.4. Here, the local direction vectors do not correspond with the underlying global direction




Fig.6: local \vec{E} directions for Fig.4.a and Fig.4.b (normalized vectors).

3.2. Discussion

Results obtained with directionality grouping (Fig.4) markedly differ from those obtained with proximity grouping (Fig.5). The schematic four tokens pattern of Fig.3 exemplifies the basic reason for the difference; such patterns can be found at various locations in Fig.4 and Fig.5. This difference between proximity and directionality grouping makes them complementary and calls for a two-stage grouping model where advantages of each mechanism could be jointly used. This aspect is currently being investigated.

The approach needs no tuning or parametrization, apart from the choice of d_{max} . Various means for automatically determining an appropriate d_{max} value are being experimented. One possibility is to select the first possible grouping, as being the one which groups more than $x\%$ of all tokens. From a more general perspective though, the problem of selecting d_{max} is reminiscent of the pervasive scale determination problem. This question arises at every level in a vision system, iconic as well as symbolic. It is therefore possible that an appropriate observation scale could be determined by an entirely different approach, for example based on measures in scale space [Koe84] [Bru90].

Grouping is here limited to linking tokens by pairs, although the similarity measure (Eq.5) could be used as well to group n -tuples of dots. Groups of $n > 2$ dots would however not allow definition of the local direction vectors, whose supports are pairs of tokens. Grouping such pairs into more complex patterns is certainly of interest, but it seems more appropriate to do this by hierarchically linking pairs two by two rather than by joining them all at once.

The line segments obtained by pairing tokens do not define direction vectors in the strict sense, but rather the supports of these vectors: there is a 180 degrees ambiguity in their orientation. This ambiguity simply reflects the ambiguity of the pattern. When looking at Fig.1.a, the overall direction can equally well be perceived as going towards the upper-right corner than towards the lower-left one. The Moiré of Fig.1.b can be perceived clockwise as well as counter-clockwise. Such type of ambiguity is inherent to images that are static. Patterns varying with time would be needed to raise it; they would unequivocally define an orientation, such as towards the upper-left with a 45° angle. Time varying Maxwell's equation could possibly be used to help determine the optical flow vectors.

Finally, another characteristic of the present approach that deserves notice is that it is invariant under monotonous transformations of interpoint distances. If images are scaled by a factor α , and d_{max} also is scaled to $\alpha \cdot d_{max}$, results will be the same.

4. Conclusion

A robust, deterministic computational model for directional grouping has been presented. This model integrates local processes into coherent, global operations. Although extremely simple in concept as well as in implementation, it appears as an elegant and powerful means for:

- hierarchically linking tokens that lie along the perceived global direction;
- determining the supports of the local direction vectors.

This functional grouping relies on directionality of patterns, and is markedly different from what a nearest-neighbor based grouping would provide. The differing characteristics of proximity and directionality grouping therefore pave the way towards a two-stage model combining their respective properties.

Acknowledgments

The support of the Swiss National Research Foundation (FNRS) through grants 20-26475.89 and 4023-027036 is gratefully acknowledged. The authors thank Pierre-Yves Burgi for many stimulating discussions and comments.

Appendix: Fundamentals of Maxwell's Equations

A1. Electrostatic and magnetostatic case

The present electromagnetic model assumes no temporal variation: images are static, stimuli are constant with respect to time. Hence the electrostatic differential Maxwell's equations [Ram84]:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \times \vec{E} &= 0 \\ \nabla \cdot \vec{D} &= \rho \end{aligned} \quad \text{Eq.9}$$

where \vec{E} is the electrical field, \vec{D} the electrical displacement and ρ the volumetric charge density. In a linear medium, \vec{E} and \vec{D} are linearly related by the medium permittivity ϵ :

$$\vec{D} = \epsilon \vec{E} \quad \text{Eq.10}$$

Since the curl of a gradient is identically zero, Eq.9.a implies that \vec{E} is the gradient of some scalar field. This defines the electrical potential V :

$$\vec{E} = -\nabla V \quad \text{Eq.11}$$

A2. Electrostatic with charges: Poisson's equation

In the presence of space charges, Eq.9.b, Eq.10 and Eq.11 yield Poisson's equation:

$$\nabla^2 V = \Delta V = -\rho/\epsilon \quad \text{Eq.12}$$

In the case of one point charge q (Fig.A1), \vec{E} has only a radial component E_r , where r is the distance to the charge:

$$E_r = q/(4\pi\epsilon r^2) \quad \text{Eq.13}$$

The potential V is obtained by integration:

$$V = q/(4\pi\epsilon r) \quad (+ \text{ constant}) \quad \text{Eq.14}$$




Fig.A1: one electrical charge, with the 3D coordinates system centered on it. θ and r are cylindrical coordinates.

This result can be extended to a set of i point charges q_i , $i = 1..N$:

$$V(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon} \sum_i \frac{q_i}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|} \quad \text{Eq.15}$$

where \vec{r} , \vec{r}_i and $|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|$ respectively denote observer's position, charge i 's position and the distance between observer and charge i , all in a common absolute coordinates system. \vec{E} is obtained by expressing Eq.11 in cylindrical coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{E} &= -\nabla_{\vec{r}} V \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon} \sum_i q_i \frac{(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i|^3} \end{aligned} \quad \text{Eq.16}$$

V and \vec{E} have singularities on the charges; this corresponds to the fact that \vec{E} arrives radially on each on them. $V(x,y)$ and $\vec{E}(x,y)$ are directly computed by adding individual contributions (Eq.15, Eq.16). This approach is simpler than the one presented in [Pun89], where a relaxation mechanism is used to solve Laplace's equation $\Delta V = 0$ in order to obtain potential and field.

References

- [Att54] F. Attneave, "Some informational aspects of visual perception", *Psychological Review*, 61, 1954, 183-193.
- [Att82] F. Attneave, "Prägnanz and soap-bubble systems: a theoretical exploration", in: *Organization and representation in perception*, J. Beck, Ed., Lawrence Erlbaum Ass. Publ., 1982, 11-29.
- [Bec82] J. Beck, Introduction of: *Organization and representation in perception*, J. Beck, Ed., Lawrence Erlbaum Ass. Publ., 1982, 1-10.
- [Bec83] J. Beck, K. Prazdny and A. Rosenfeld, "A theory of textural segmentation, in: *Human and Machine Vision*", J. Beck, B. Hope and A. Rosenfeld, Eds., Academic Press, 1983, 1-38.
- [Bru90] K. Brunnström, J.-O. Eklundh, T. Lindeberg, "On scale and resolution in the analysis of local image structure", in: *Proc. First Eur. Conf. Comp. Vision*, Antibes, France, 1990, 3-12.
- [Bur91] P.-Y. Burgi and T. Pun, "Figure-ground separation: evidences for asynchronous processing in visual perception?", submitted, February 1991.
- [Dod83] P.C. Dodwell, "The Lie transformation group model of visual perception", *Perception and Psychophysics*, 34, 1, 1983, 1-16.
- [Ead88] P. Eades, "Symmetry finding algorithms", in: *Computational Morphology*, G.T. Toussaint, Ed., 1988, 41-51.
- [Gla69] L. Glass, "Moiré effect from random dots", *Nature*, 223, Aug. 9, 1969, 578-580.
- [Gro88] S. Grossberg, E. Mingolla, M.A. Cohen and coworkers, *The Adaptive Brain II: Vision, Speech, Language, and Motor Control*, S. Grossberg, Ed., North-Holland, 1988, Chaps. 1 to 4.
- [Hof85] W.C. Hoffman and P.C. Dodwell, "Geometric psychology generates the visual Gestalt", *Canadian J. of Psychology*, 39, 4, 1985, 491-528.
- [Jul83] B. Julesz and J.R. Bergen, "Textons: the fundamental elements in preattentive vision and the perception of texture", *Bell Systems Tech. Journal*, 62, 6, Jul.-Aug., 1983, 1619-1644.
- [Kas85] M. Kass and A. Witkin, "Analyzing oriented patterns", *Proc. IJCAI*, Los Angeles, 1985, 944-952.
- [Kau84] L. Kaufman, Y.C. Okada, J. Tripp, H. Weinberg, "Evoked neuromagnetic fields", in: *Brain and Information: Event-related Potentials*, R. Karrer, J. Cohen, P. Tueting, Eds. Also: *Annals of the New-York Academy of Sciences*, 425, 1984, 722-742.
- [Koe84] J.J. Koenderinck, "The structures of images", *Biol. Cybernetics*, 50, 363-370, 1984.
- [Koh20] W. Köhler, "Die physischen Gestalten in Ruhe und im stationären Zustand", *Eine naturphilosophische Untersuchung*, Erlangen, 1920. Translated as: *Physical Gestalten*, in: *A Source Book in Gestalt Psychology*, W.D. Ellis, Ed., 1938, 17-54.
- [Koh44] W. Köhler and H. Wallach, "Figural after-effects: an investigation of visual processes", *Proc. Americ. Philos. Soc.*, 88, 1944, 269-357.
- [Lee71] E. Leeuwenberg, "A perceptual coding language for visual and auditory patterns", *Amer. J. of Psychology*, 84, 1971, 307-349.
- [Low82] D.G. Lowe and T.O. Binford, "Segmentation and aggregation: an approach to figure-ground phenomena", *Proc. DARPA Image Understanding Workshop*, Palo-Alto, CA, Sept. 1982, 168-178.
- [Pal83] S.E. Palmer, "The psychology of perceptual organization: a transformational approach", in: *Human and Machine Vision*, J. Beck, B. Hope and A. Rosenfeld, Eds., Academic Press, 1983, 269-339.
- [Pom77] J.R. Pomerantz, L.C. Sager and R.J. Stoever, "Perception of wholes and their component parts: some configural superiority effects", *Journal of Exp. Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 3, 3, 1977, 422-435.
- [Pun89] T. Pun and P.-Y. Burgi, "Perceptual grouping of image primitives using a potential and field approach", *Proc. 6th Scand. Conf. Image Analysis*, Oulu, Finland, 1989, 317-324.
- [Ram84] S. Ramo, J.R. Whinnery and T. van Duzer, *Fields and Waves in Communication Electronics*, 2nd. Ed., J. Wiley, 1984 (or any undergraduate textbook on electromagnetism).
- [Res82] F. Restle, "Coding theory as an integration of Gestalt psychology and information processing theory", in: *Organization and representation in perception*, J. Beck, Ed., Lawrence Erlbaum Ass. Publ., 1982, 31-56.
- [Sch90] T.B. Schillen and P. König, "Coherency detection and response segregation by synchronizing and desynchronizing delay connections in a neuronal oscillator model", *IJCNN*, Int. Join Conf. on Neural Networks, San Diego, CA, June 17-21, 1990, II.387-II.395.
- [Ste78] K.A. Stevens, "Computation of locally parallel structure", *Biol. Cybernetics*, 29, 1978, 19-28.
- [Ull84] S. Ullman, "Visual routines", *Cognition*, 18, 1984, 97-159.
- [Wer23] M. Wertheimer, "Laws of organization in perceptual forms", *Psychologische Forschung*, 1923, 4, 301-350. Translation in: *A Source Book in Gestalt Psychology*, W.D. Ellis, Ed., 1938, 71-88.
- [Wit83] A.P. Witkin and J.M. Tenenbaum, "On the role of structure in vision", in: *Human and Machine Vision*, J. Beck, B. Hope and A. Rosenfeld, Eds., Academic Press, 1983, 269-339.
- [Yue90] S.K. Yuen, "Shape from contours using symmetries", in: *Proc. First Eur. Conf. Comp. Vision*, Antibes, France, 1990, 437-453.
- [Zuc83] S.W. Zucker, "Computational and psychophysical experiments in grouping: early orientation selection", in: *Human and Machine Vision*, J. Beck, B. Hope and A. Rosenfeld, Eds., Academic Press, 1983.
- [Zuc85] S.W. Zucker, "Early orientation selection: tangent fields and the dimensionality of their support", *Comp. Vision, Graphics and Image Processing*, 32, 1, Oct. 1985, 74-103.