Ch. 10 Vector Quantization

Overview

1

Motivation

Recall in Lossless Methods:

- Block Huffman is better than single-symbol Huffman
 - Blocks allow to exploit correlation between symbols (assuming source symbols are <u>not</u> independent!)
- Shannon <u>proved</u> that "blocking taken to the limit" achieves optimal compression... exploits correlation

Recall in Scalar Quantization:

- It is the lossy version of a <u>single</u>-symbol method
- Shannon also <u>proved</u> that for <u>lossy</u> we can achieve the <u>theoretical bound</u> on compression (R-D curve) via "<u>blocking</u> taken to the limit"

This blocking idea motivates Vector Quantization

Main Idea of VQ

That info theory says to consider "blocking" to exploit correlation

→ Group into vectors (non-overlapping) and "quantize" each vector



Illustration of Gain from VQ: Real Speech Data



Going to higher dimension: vectors concentrated in smaller % of whole space → Improved Performance



Forming Vectors

For time signals... we usually form vectors from temporally-sequential samples.

For images... we usually form vectors from spatially-sequential samples.



But... you should let the ACF structure guide your choice...



Designing VQ

Q: What does it mean to design a VQ?

A: Similar to SQ... Specify Decision Boundaries and Reconstruction Values... except now those are in *N*-D space... Goal is to minimize MSQE for a given rate (or vice versa)

Example of a VQ Design: For 2-D

vectors taken from a sequence of <u>independent Gaussian</u> samples...



Figure from book Vector Quantization and Signal Compression by Gersho & Gray

Structure of a VQ

Fig. 10.1 in Textbook





Encoder & Decoder Operation

Encoder: *Search* codebook for code vector \mathbf{y}_j that is closest to input vector \mathbf{x} .

Codebook $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^M = C$ where each $\mathbf{y}_i \in \Re^L$

x is closest to \mathbf{y}_i if:

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_{j}\| \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_{i}\| \quad \forall \mathbf{y}_{i} \in C \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{j}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{i}) \quad \forall \mathbf{y}_{i} \in C$$
where $\|\mathbf{z}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L} z_{i}^{2}}$ (Euclidian Norm) $\frac{Notation}{V}$: If \mathbf{x} is closest to \mathbf{y}_{j} we write $Q(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}_{j}$
for $\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} & z_{2} & \cdots & z_{L} \end{bmatrix}^{T}$ $\frac{Note}{RLs}$ & these equations rather than explicit boundaries!!!

Decoder: Use received binary codeword (the "index") as an address into the codebook (i.e., Table Look-Up)

Complexity of VQ

Encoder is Computationally Complex

Must check all $M \mathbf{y}_i$ for closeness... must compute M norms

M can be quite large: 256, 512, 1024, etc.

Decoder is Easy & Fast

VQ Complexity is Asymmetrical

- May not work well for Real-Time Encoding
- But Real-Time <u>De</u>coding is very easy

VQ Rate & Performance vs. Rate

If *L*-D vectors are quantized using a VQ having *M* reconstruction points we need binary codewords having

codeword length =
$$\lceil \log_2 M \rceil$$
 bits/vector
bits/sample = $\frac{\lceil \log_2 M \rceil}{L}$ bits/sample

'Typical'' *L* values:

• Images:
$$L = 16 (4x4)$$

• Speech: *L* = 3,4,5,6

Info Theory Says: Increasing *L* improves the VQ performance

Practice Says: ... only up to a point!

- Improvement decreases w/ increasing L
- Design gets harder w/ increasing L
- Encoder complexity grows w/ increasing L

