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Abstract

Accurate alignment of calcium imaging data, which is critical for the extraction of neuronal activity signals, is often hindered by the image noise and the neuronal activity itself. To address the problem, we propose an algorithm named REALS for robust and efficient batch image alignment through simultaneous transformation and low rank and sparse decomposition. REALS is constructed upon our finding that the low rank subspace can be recovered via linear projection, which allows us to perform simultaneous image alignment and decomposition with gradient-based updates. REALS achieves orders-of-magnitude improvement in terms of accuracy and speed compared to the state-of-the-art robust image alignment algorithms.

1. Introduction

Calcium imaging has enabled simultaneous recording of the activity of a large population of neurons in vivo owing to the recent advancement of genetically-encoded calcium indicators [9, 10, 33, 43] and fluorescence microscopy techniques [1, 6, 11, 29, 39]. State-of-the-art calcium imaging methods allow data acquisition at up to thousands of frames per second [34] which corresponds to gigabytes of data per second [15]. Such a large amount of data has not only provided exciting opportunities for system neuroscience, but also introduced new challenges for the data analysis [15]. General pipelines for processing large scale calcium imaging data typically start with motion correction or image alignment [13], which is critical for accurate extraction of spiking activities from a calcium imaging dataset that suffer from the motion of the brain.

Unfortunately, the neuronal activity itself — the signal of our interests — in the images makes even the well-aligned images significantly different from one another [20] which poses a challenge to the accurate image alignment. This indicates that alignment needs to be done considering the underlying structure of the images rather than relying solely on the pixel level information.

To address this problem, there have been multiple attempts to employ robust image alignment algorithms such as Robust Alignment by Sparse and Low rank decomposition (RASL) [26], that aims to align a set of significantly different images, for the alignment of calcium imaging data [2, 14, 28]. RASL unified image alignment with low rank and sparse decomposition [7] as a single optimization problem. Through low rank and sparse decomposition, various forms of image corruption, such as noise and occlusion, are absorbed by the sparse component so that the alignment performed on the low rank component is not affected by them. This opened up the possibility of accurate alignment of calcium imaging data.

Unfortunately, the adoption of the robust alignment algorithms has been limited to processing relatively small sized datasets largely due to their high computational costs. The cost mainly comes from singular value decomposition (SVD), which has a computational complexity of $O(nm^2 + n^2m)$ where $n$ and $m$ are the sizes of the data along two dimensions. That is, $m$ is the number of pixels in each image, and $n$ is the number of images in a typical configuration. This indicates that the computational cost increases rapidly with an increase in the data size.

To overcome this limitation, we propose Robust and Efficient Alignment through Simultaneous low rank and sparse decomposition (REALS) for fast and robust image alignment. The main contributions of our work are as follows:

- We provide a mathematical proof, upon which REALS is built, that the low rank subspace can be recovered via linear projection.
We propose a robust image alignment algorithm REALS with a computational complexity of $O(nm)$ as opposed to $O(nm^2 + n^2m)$ of the existing methods.

We propose two extended versions of REALS, multi-resolution REALS and deformable REALS, that achieve even higher alignment accuracy under challenging conditions.

We demonstrate its capability by applying it to the in vivo calcium imaging datasets which require robustness, scalability, and computational efficiency.

2. Related Works

2.1. Low rank and sparse decomposition

Candès et al. [7] proposed robust principal component analysis (RPCA), which recovers a low rank matrix $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a sparse matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that $Y = L + S$ for a given data matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, assuming that the data matrix $Y$ is approximately drawn from a low rank subspace. This is based on the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{L,S} \|L\|_* + \lambda \|S\|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Y = L + S$$

where $\|S\|_0$ is the $L_0$ norm of $S$ and $\lambda > 0$ is a hyperparameter. While [1] is known to be computationally intractable, Emmanuel et al. [7], and Wright et al. [35] showed that the exact solution of (1) can be obtained through the following convex optimization under weak assumptions:

$$\min_{L,S} \|L\|_* + \lambda \|S\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Y = L + S$$

where $\|L\|_*$ is the nuclear norm (i.e., the sum of the singular values) of $L$ and $\|S\|_1$ is the $L_1$ norm of $S$. This formulation sparked the development of a series of algorithms for solving [3] [7] [8] [35] and various optimization methods were adopted to reduce the computation time [23] [24] [44] [45]. In addition, online versions of RPCA based on stochastic optimization were introduced to reduce the memory cost [12] [16] [17] [37]. Recently, Han et al. [13] proposed an algorithm for efficient approximation of RPCA.

2.2. Robust image alignment

Peng et al. [26] formulated a batch image alignment problem as follows: Suppose we have $n$ misaligned and corrupted images $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h}$ of the same object. Assume the corruptions typically affect only a small fraction of all pixels in an image so that they can be modeled as a sparse matrix whose nonzero entries can have arbitrary values. Let $s_i$ represent the error that appears in image $I_i$. Then, there exist transformations (e.g., affine transformation) $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$ such that the images $\{\tau_i(I_i) - s_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are well aligned to each other and have no corruptions. Since $\{\tau_i(I_i) - s_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a set of the aligned images without error, the following matrix $L$ should be approximately low rank:

$$L = [v(T_1^0) \cdots v(T_n^0)] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$$

where $T_i^0 = \tau_i(I_i) - s_i$, and $v: \mathbb{R}^{w \times h} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ($m = w \times h$) denote the vectorization of an image. Based on this reasoning, the image alignment problem is formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{L,S,\tau} \|L\|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Y = L + S, \quad \|S\|_0 \leq k$$

where $Y = [v(I_1) \cdots v(I_n)], S = [v(s_1) \cdots v(s_n)],$ and $\tau(Y) = [v(I_1 \circ \tau_1) \cdots v(I_n \circ \tau_n)]$. The Lagrangian form of this problem is as follows:

$$\min_{L,S,\tau} \|L\|_0 + \gamma \|S\|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \tau(Y) = L + S$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a hyperparameter. To handle the non-linearity of the constraint $\tau(Y) = L + S$, Peng et al. [26] approximated the constraint by linearizing the current estimate of $\tau$ so that the linearized convex optimization problem can be efficiently solved using the Augmented Lagrange Multiplier method [23]. They relaxed the objective (5) to its convex surrogate and linearized the nonlinear constraint, $\tau(Y) = L + S$, by assuming that the change in $\tau$ is small.

Zhang et al. [41] generalized the problem in (5) into a low rank tensor recovery framework to exploit spatial structures in images. They minimized the tensor rank, defined as the ranks of a set of unfolding matrices, acquired by applying Tucker decomposition [21] to the given tensor. The cost of solving the optimization problem in both [26] [41] comes mainly from SVD which has a computational complexity of $O(nn^2 + n^2m)$.

t-GRSTA (transformed GRISTA) [18] is based on GRISTA [17] which is a low rank subspace estimation algorithm that represents a low rank matrix as a product of two matrices through gradient descent performed on the Grassmannian. The computational complexity of t-GRISTA is $O(n^3m)$ [16].

3. Proposed Method

3.1. Robust and efficient alignment through simultaneous low rank and sparse decomposition

Building upon [26], we formulate the robust image alignment problem as follows:

$$\min_{L,S,\tau} \|S\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \tau(Y) = L + S, \quad \text{rank}(L) \leq l$$

which is obtained by replacing the rank minimization in (5) by the maximum rank constraint on $L$ where the maximum rank $l$ is a small natural number. Then, we use proposition
to find a surrogate that is differentiable with respect to the trainable parameters. Below, $C(A)$ and $\langle , \rangle$ denote the column space of a matrix $A$, and the dot product operation, respectively.

**Proposition 1.** For given $Y, L, S \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ where $Y = L + S$, if $C(L) \cap C(S) = \{0\}$ then there exists $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$ such that $L_i = \sum_j <W_j, Y_i > W_j$ where $L_i, Y_i,$ and $W_i (i = 1, \ldots, n)$ are the $i$-th columns of $L$, $Y$, and $W$, respectively.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, let $m > n$. Let an arbitrary orthonormal basis of $C(L)$ be $L_0 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_l\}$. Since $C(L) \cap C(S) = \{0\}$, there exists $S_0 = \{v_{l+1}, \ldots, v_m\}$ that spans $C(S)$ such that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{l+s}\}$ is orthonormal. Note that $l + s < m$. Then, there exists $\{v_{l+s+1}, \ldots, v_m\}$ such that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Let $P$ be an $m \times m$ matrix such that the $j$-th column of $P^T$ is $v_j (j = 1, \ldots, m)$. Then, $P$ is the change-of-basis matrix whose columns are the new coordinate vectors $v_j$’s on the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then, we can construct a diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that $PL = DPY$ by setting $D_{ii} = 1$ if $1 \leq i \leq l$, and $D_{ii} = 0$ otherwise. Note that $P$ is invertible and orthonormal. Since $P^{-1} = P^T$, $L = P^T DPY = (P^T D^T) (D) Y$ where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that $D_{ij}$ equals 1 if $1 \leq i \leq l$ and 0 otherwise. Therefore, by setting $W = P^T D^T$, $L_i = \sum_j <W_j, Y_i > W_j$. 

Thus, there exists a matrix that projects the matrix $Y$ to its low rank subspace, if $C(L) \cap C(S) = \{0\}$. This condition is approximately met, if rank($L$) is small and $S$ is a sparse matrix (i.e., if $S_i$, the $i$-th column of $S$, is an $m$-dimensional random sparse vector and rank($L$) $\ll m$, then $<L_i, S_j > \approx 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$). Note that the same assumption was used for the convex relaxation in (2). Under such condition, the optimization problem in (6) is equivalent to the following:

$$\min_{W, \theta} ||S||_1 \quad \text{where}$$

$$S_i = \tau_{i}^\theta (Y_i) - \sum_j <W_j, \tau_{i}^\theta (Y_i) > W_j \quad \text{(7)}$$

where $\tau_{i}^\theta$ is the transformation applied to the $i$-th column of $Y$, parameterized by $\theta$ using the differentiable image transformation (2) to make the objective function differentiable. The intuition behind this formulation is that $L$ is a low rank subspace of $\text{tau}(Y)$ (2) and it can be found through linear projection of $\text{tau}(Y)$ to a lower dimensional space defined as the column space of $W$. We note that similar formulation was employed in (15) to find a surrogate, but without mathematical interpretations or proofs.

Importantly, this objective function is differentiable with respect to all optimization parameters and hence allows gradient-based updates. Therefore, convergence to the local optimum is guaranteed (5). In addition, each gradient-based update of $\theta$ and $W$ has a computational complexity of only $O(nm)$: each $\tau_{i}^\theta$ consists of linear summation operations on $Y$ (9) that linearly scales with the number of pixels $m$, and updating $W$ requires only matrix multiplications with $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$ and $W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$ (15). This is in contrast to the complexity of $O(nm^2 + n^2m)$ (26, 41) or $O(n^2m)$ (18) of the existing methods.

Furthermore, this framework allows us to handle arbitrary sized data through stochastic gradient descent (31). As a side benefit, since both forward propagation and back-propagation are possible in REALS, it can be easily combined with other trainable functions for end-to-end learning. As an example, we show that REALS can be combined with non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) (22) to perform unsupervised neuron segmentation in Section 5.3.

It should be noted that the global minima of both (5) and (7) are zeros which can be achieved by any transformation $\tau_{i}^\theta$ that gives transformed images full of zeros. To avoid convergence to such an undesired global minimum, we initialized $\tau_{i}^\theta$ as identity mapping at the beginning of optimization and clamped the values of $\theta$ after each parameter update (see Algorithm S1 in the supplementary materials). Instead of parameter clamping, one can set a reference image by freezing the transformation parameters for the image.

REALS can be easily extended to handle 3-D images by extending vectorization $v$ as $v : \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m (m = w \times h \times d)$. This extension maintains the differentiability of the objective function of REALS with respect to $W$ and $\theta$.

### 3.2. Multi-resolution REALS

We introduce an extended version of REALS that makes use of a multi-resolution image pyramid, which is a common strategy for aligning a set of large images with large misalignment (25, 22). For a set of images $Y = \{v(I_1) \cdot | \cdot v(I_n)\}$ where $I_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h}$, we generate an image pyramid $Y(k) = \{v(I_1(k)) \cdot | \cdot v(I_n(k))\}$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h}$ is a downsampled image of $I_i$. Then, for each $Y(k)$, we have an optimization objective as in (7). Since the transformation should remain the same for a given image regardless of $k$ assuming that the translation parameters are defined at a relative scale, the objective function can be written as follows:

$$\min_{W_i(\theta)} \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k ||S(k)||_1 \quad \text{(8)}$$

where $\beta_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a hyperparameter that controls the relative contribution of each level, and $S(k)$ and corresponding $W(k)$ from the image pyramid $Y(k)$ are constructed as in (7). Since this objective function is differentiable with respect to $\theta$ and $W(k)$ for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, K\}$, gradient-based optimization can be used to update the parameters.
3.3. Deformable REALS

As the optimization problem in REALS is formulated in a form that allows backpropagation, it can be easily extended to handle affine transformation and deformable transformation simultaneously by setting the transformation $\tau^\theta$ in (7) as a composite function of parameterized affine and deformable transformations (i.e., $\tau^\theta = \tau^\theta_1 \circ \tau^\theta_2$, where $\tau^\theta_1$ is deformable transformation and $\tau^\theta_2$ is affine transformation). The deformable transformation $\tau^\theta_1$ is parameterized by the displacement field $\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times 2}$ that encodes that relative position of the each pixel before and after the transformation [3, 4]. The optimization objective of deformable REALS is as follows:

$$\min_{W,\theta_1,\theta_2} ||S||_1 + \lambda_1 ||\theta_1||_1 + \lambda_2 L_{\text{smooth}}(\theta_1)$$

where $||\theta_1||_1$ and $L_{\text{smooth}}(\theta_1)$ are the regularization terms employed to introduce preferences for affine transformation over deformable transformation and spatially smooth deformation [3], respectively. $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are hyperparameters. This simplifies the conventional two-step registration pipelines for the biomedical images [3] that sequentially perform affine and deformable transformations to correspond to the movement and the deformation of biological tissues, respectively.

4. Experiments and Results

We compared REALS with RASL [26], t-GRASTA [18], and $l_p$+ADMM [41]. For testing REALS, RASL, t-GRASTA, and $l_p$+ADMM on a CPU, we used a PC with an Intel i7-9700K CPU and 128GB of RAM. The source code distributed by the authors was written in MATLAB without GPU acceleration. For testing the performance of REALS on a GPU, we used a PC with an Intel Xeon Silver 4214 CPU, an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU and 128GB of RAM. REALS was implemented using Pytorch.

4.1. Testing on digit, window and Al Gore dataset

To validate REALS, we verified how REALS and other algorithms (RASL, t-GRASTA, and $l_p$+ADMM) performed on three datasets that were typically used for testing robust image alignment algorithms [18, 26, 30, 31, 36, 41]. Due to the absence of the ground truth aligned images, the alignment results were compared visually. REALS successfully recovered the low rank images (Fig. 1) and all methods yielded qualitatively similar results (Fig. S1)

4.2. Testing on a zebrafish brain dataset

4.2.1 Larval zebrafish brain dataset

For quantification of the performance, we generated and used a synthetic dataset with known geometric perturbations, from which the alignment accuracy could be measured. We first imaged the whole-brain neuronal activity of a larval zebrafish that was strictly immobilized using both physical (i.e., embedding in a gel) and chemical (i.e., exposing to paralytics) means. Hence, the series of acquired images is free from misalignment while exhibiting significant changes due to neuronal activity and noise as shown in Fig. 2(a). Then, each image is perturbed by Euclidean transformation (i.e., translation and rotation) with random yet known parameters to construct a dataset for testing robust alignment algorithms (Fig. 2(b)). The animal experiments conducted for this study were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) of KAIST (KA2021-125).

We note that the acquired images are linear superposition of the underlying structure of the brain and the neuronal activity with time-dependent spatio-temporal patterns, and hence they can be modeled as the sum of a low rank matrix and a sparse matrix [40]. The size of the acquired dataset

![Figure 1: Testing REALS on standard datasets. (Top) Input images. (Bottom) Recovered low rank images.](image1)

![Figure 2: Zebrafish brain dataset. (a) Source images acquired by performing calcium imaging of a larval zebrafish brain. (b) Synthetic images with known geometric perturbations. Scale bar, 100 \( \mu \)m.](image2)
was $512(x) \times 512(y) \times 60(t)$. Further details on the dataset are described in the Supplementary Note 1.1.

### 4.2.2 Performance metric

Previous works relied on human annotated data to estimate alignment accuracy [18, 26, 36] or used the reconstruction error in the recovered low rank matrix as an indirect measure of the alignment accuracy [30, 31, 41], neither of which is suited for the precise assessment of the alignment accuracy on a large scale dataset. As multiple sets of transformations that align the images well with respect to other images are equally valid (i.e., the optimal set of transformations is not unique), we used mean squared error (MSE) defined as follows for evaluating the alignment accuracy:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||(\tau^\text{align} \circ \tau^\text{rand})(I_i) - \mu(\{\tau^\text{rand} \circ \tau^\text{align}\}_{j=1}^{n})(I_i)||_F$$

where $\{\tau^\text{rand}\}_{j=1}^{n}$ is a set of random transformations, $\{\tau^\text{align}\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is a set of transformations that is acquired with an alignment algorithm, $\mu(\{\tau_j\}_{j=1}^{n})$ is the transformation that averages each parameter from $\tau_j$’s ($j = 1, \ldots, n$), and $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is a set of aligned images (see Movie S1 for the visual assessment of the alignment accuracy with multiple MSE values).

### 4.2.3 Performance comparison setting

We compared the following methods in terms of MSE and computation time: REALS, RASL, t-GRASTA [18], and $l_p$+ADMM [41]. We used Euclidean transformation for all the methods. We ran REALS for 2000 iterations, and used $1 \times 10^{-4}$ and $1 \times 10^{-2}$ as the learning rates for $W$ and $\tau$, respectively. Clamping parameters were set to limit the maximum translation in horizontal and vertical directions as 64 pixels and the maximum rotation angle with respect to the image center as 35°. The hyperparameters were set as proposed in [18, 26, 41].

### 4.2.4 Translation and rotation

We first compared the performance of the alignment algorithms on datasets with varying levels of misalignment where the neuronal activity and the native noise in the images served as the outliers. We synthetically perturbed the input images with Euclidean transformations whose angles of rotation were drawn from $U(-\theta_0, \theta_0)$, where $U(a, b)$ denotes a uniform distribution between $a$ and $b$, and both $x$ and $y$-translations were drawn from $U(-t_0, t_0)$. For REALS, we ran 5 independent trials with random seeds for the synthetic perturbations for the performance measurement at each setting (see Table S1 for the hyperparameters). For testing other methods, we ran single trials at each setting because of the long computational time.

Fig. 3 shows the MSE of each method on the datasets with different levels of translation and rotation. REALS outperformed other methods by a large margin in terms of MSE. The average computation time and the average MSE of each method measured from the trials in Fig. 3 are summarized in Table 1. REALS achieved an order of magnitude improvement in terms of both speed and accuracy compared to the other methods (see Fig. S2 for the computation time at each experimental setting). In addition, to monitor the convergence behavior of the algorithms, we measured the MSE with a time stamp after each parameter update. As shown in Fig. 4, REALS on GPU took 100-1000 times shorter than RASL, t-GRASTA, and $l_p$+ADMM to achieve the same level of MSE. REALS on CPU was about 10 times slower than that on GPU, but it was still significantly faster than other algorithms. The MSE as a function of the number of parameter updates is in Fig. S3 which shows that REALS requires smaller number of iterations for convergence on top of the cheaper complexity of each iteration.

![Mean Square Error](image)

**Figure 3:** Heatmaps showing the mean squared error of REALS, RASL, t-GRASTA and $l_p$+ADMM. The algorithms were tested for the datasets with various levels of geometric perturbations (translation and rotation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time (±std)</th>
<th>Mean squared error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALS</td>
<td>79.8 ± 2.4</td>
<td>$3.9 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASL</td>
<td>2419.2 ± 46.2</td>
<td>2.4 $\times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-GRASTA</td>
<td>856.2 ± 78.6</td>
<td>3.4 $\times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_p$+ADMM</td>
<td>2305.8 ± 4395.6</td>
<td>4.3 $\times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Computation time (unit: second) and mean squared error of REALS, RASL, t-GRASTA and $l_p$+ADMM.
4.2.5 Additional image corruption

To compare the robustness of the alignment algorithms against image corruption, we added Poisson and Gaussian noise to the input images and measured the MSE (see Movie S2 for visual assessment of the noise level). We varied the level of Poisson noise and Gaussian noise and perturbed the images with multiple combinations of translation and rotations: \((t_0, \theta_0) \in \{(0, 0^\circ), (6, 4^\circ), (12, 8^\circ), (18, 12^\circ), (24, 16^\circ)\}\). To add Poisson noise to the images, we first normalized the input images and multiplied them by the brightness level \((\in \{33, 100, 333, 1000, \infty\}\), and then used each pixel value as the parameter (i.e., mean value) of the Poisson distribution. In this configuration, the physical meaning of the brightness level is the expected number of photons that hit the brightest pixel. For Gaussian noise, we first normalized the input images and added Gaussian noise with a standard deviation of \(\sigma \in \{0.0, 0.001, 0.003, 0.01, 0.03\}\).

In addition, as another way of testing the robustness of the alignment algorithms, we synthesized the images of neuronal activity with the reduced low rank components — which is equivalent to the relative increase of sparse components — as follows. We first applied BEAR \([15]\) to the larval zebrafish brain dataset \(Y\) and acquired low rank matrix \(L\) and sparse matrix \(S\). Then, we reconstructed the images with the reduced low rank component as \(Y_\alpha = \alpha L + S\), where \(\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0\}\), and then applied random perturbation to \(Y_\alpha\). This setting with \(\alpha < 1\) can be considered as simulating future neuronal activity imaging data, as the relative brightness change of the optical neuronal activity indicators compared to their baseline brightness — which determines that ratio of \(S\) and \(L\) — has been continuously increasing \([42]\).

We measured the MSE for the datasets with these additional image corruptions and the results are reported in Table 2 (see Fig. S4 for the MSE at each experimental setting). REALS outperformed other methods under challenging conditions which proves its robustness against various forms of image corruption.

We tested the performance of the multi-resolution REALS under challenging conditions (see Table 2 for the hyperparameters). We first added Poisson noise that corresponded to the brightness level of 33 and Gaussian noise with \(\sigma = 0.03\) to the images. We then applied large geometric perturbations that ranged from \((t_0, \theta_0) = (30, 25^\circ)\) to \((t_0, \theta_0) = (90, 45^\circ)\). We ran 5 independent trials to compare REALS and multi-resolution REALS. Multi-resolution REALS showed up to 5 times lower MSE than REALS as summarized in Table 3.

4.2.6 Multi-resolution REALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Poisson noise</th>
<th>Gaussian noise</th>
<th>Reduced low rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALS</td>
<td>3.9 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>7.7 \times 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASL</td>
<td>2.8 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>1.8 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-GRASTA</td>
<td>3.1 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>3.0 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>2.7 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l_p)+ADMM</td>
<td>3.6 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>3.5 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mean squared error of REALS, RASL, t-GRASTA and \(l_p\)+ADMM for the images with additional corruption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>((t_0, \theta_0))</th>
<th>Input images*</th>
<th>REALS</th>
<th>m-REALS†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30, 25°)</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45, 30°)</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60, 35°)</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75, 40°)</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90, 45°)</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Mean squared error (MSE) of REALS and multi-resolution REALS. *MSE of the input images (i.e., \(\tau^{align}\) is an identity transformation). †multi-resolution REALS.

4.2.7 Deformable REALS

We compared the performance of deformable REALS, introduced in Section 3.3, with VoxelMorph \([33]\) using images that were perturbed with deformable transformations. For the experiment, we generated synthetic datasets by se-
Fig. 5: Deformable image registration using deformable REALS and VoxelMorph. (a) Temporal average projections of the misaligned input images, ground truth aligned images, images aligned using deformable REALS, and images aligned using VoxelMorph. Regular grids with a pitch of 32 pixels were overlaid on the ground truth aligned images. Thus, the sharpness of the images and the grids in the average projections shows the alignment accuracy. The grids were not used for the alignment, but overlaid only for visual aid. (b) Representative frames of the input images, images aligned using deformable REALS, and images aligned using VoxelMorph. The images show the boxed area in a. Regular grids with a pitch of 16 pixels were overlaid on the ground truth aligned images. That is, the grids in the images show how the images were perturbed and aligned.

5. Additional Demonstrations

5.1. Testing on mouse brain dataset

We applied REALS to a mouse brain image dataset with a size of $480(x) \times 752(y) \times 1000(t)$ that suffered from large motion. Such motion artifacts are inevitable in in vivo mouse brain imaging even with head fixation, because the position of the brain relative to the skull changes with respiration and blood pulsation of the mouse. Despite the challenges posed by the large motion, low image contrast, and low signal-to-noise ratio, REALS successfully aligned the dataset as shown in Fig. 6 (see Table S4 and Movie S4).

5.2. REALS on 3-D data

We applied 3-D REALS on 3-D time-series images of neural activity of a zebrafish brain with a size of $256(x) \times 512(y) \times 48(z) \times 60(t)$. Similar to the 2-D image dataset, we first imaged whole-brain neuronal activity of a larval zebrafish that was strictly immobilized in 3-D. Then, we synthetically perturbed the images with Euclidean transformation whose angles of rotation around the z-axis were sampled from $U(-2, 2)$ (unit: ), and xyz-translations were sampled from $U(-4, 4)$ (unit: pixel). We used affine transformation and optimized REALS with mini-batches with the batch size of 30 (see Table S5 for the hyperparame-
Figure 6: Alignment of neuronal activity images of a mouse brain using REALS. (a) Temporal maximum intensity projection of the input images. (b) Temporal maximum intensity projection of the aligned image.

Figure 7: Alignment of 3-D neuronal activity images of a larval zebrafish brain using REALS. (a) Temporal maximum intensity projection of the 3-D input images. (b) Temporal maximum intensity projection of the 3-D aligned images. Scale bar, 100 µm.

5.3. REALS with NMF

We integrated REALS with NMF [22] to simultaneously perform image alignment, separation of neuronal activity from background, and unsupervised segmentation of neurons; in order to retain differentiability with respect to all parameters, we employed projective NMF [38] which is a differentiable formulation of NMF.

We processed a zebrafish calcium imaging video with a size of $256(x) \times 512(y) \times 600(t)$ which suffer from motion artifacts using REALS with NMF, with and without optimizing the transformation parameters. Fig. 8 shows the segmentation result, in which a random color is assigned to each spatial component. The result without optimizing the transformation parameters showed severe oversegmentation due to the motion artifacts (Fig. 8(b)). However, with transformation parameter optimization, confined spatial components that correspond to the neurons were obtained which manifested as the color uniformity within each neuron in Fig. 8(d) (see Table S6 and Movie S6).

Figure 8: REALS with NMF for simultaneous alignment, low rank and sparse decomposition, and NMF. (a) Spatial footprints from REALS with NMF, but without alignment, are colored and overlaid. (b) Spatial footprints from REALS with NMF are colored and overlaid. Same random color palette as in (a) is used. Scale bar, 30 µm.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed REALS, an algorithm for robust and efficient batch image alignment. REALS employs a differentiable image transform and differentiable low rank and sparse decomposition which are integrated in a form that we can backpropagate for gradient-based updates. This characteristic comes with multiple benefits. First, it has a significantly reduced computation complexity of $O(nm)$ and achieves orders-of-magnitude of performance improvement. Second, it can be easily generalized for the alignment of high-dimensional image data or deformed images. Third, it can be integrated with other trainable functions that allow backpropagation. The robustness, computational efficiency, and scalability of REALS make it an ideal algorithm for the alignment of calcium imaging data.
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