Abstract: Computed tomography (CT) is used in medical applications to produce digital medical imaging of the human body and is acquired by the reconstruction process, where X-rays are the key component of CT imaging. The present coronavirus outbreak has spawned new medical device and technology research fields. COVID-19 most severely affects people with poor immunity; children and pregnant women are more susceptible. A CT scan will be required to assess the infection’s severity. As a result, to reduce the radiation levels significantly there is a need to minimize the CT scan noise. The quality of CT images may degrade in the form of noisy images due to low radiation levels. Hence, this study proposes a novel denoising methodology for COVID-19 CT images with a low dose, where a convolution neural network (CNN) and batch normalization were utilized for denoising. From different output metrics such as peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) and image quality index (IQI), the accuracy of the resulting CT images was checked and evaluated, where IQI obtained the best results in terms of 99% accuracy. The findings were also compared with the outcomes of related recent research in the domain. After a detailed review of the findings, it was noted that the proposed algorithm in the present study performed better in comparison to the existing literature.
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1. Introduction

X-ray computed tomography (CT) images are widely used in the medical field to diagnose cancer and related diseases. The density of X-rays is reduced due to their dangerous
and adverse effects on the human body (damaging the DNA and giving rise to cancer), but using less ionizing radiation leads to degradation in the quality of medical images, producing mottle noise. To suppress the noise, many techniques have been explored so far [1]. However, due to the uneven distribution in low-dose CT images, it is not easy to denoise the images by using traditional algorithms and techniques. Moreover, these approaches involve very high calculation costs. In modern medical science, a CT scan is a widely used imaging technique that involves scanning the body’s internal organs using X-rays. CT scans can be used to find bone and joint problems such as fractures and tumors [2]. Computed tomography can easily spot cancer cells, heart disease, and other diseases. Therefore, it is important to have a noiseless CT image to obtain the exact information about the disease [3]. Naturally, such CT images will contain noise due to software or hardware problems of the machines as the X-rays pass through the body to generate the output. Hence, there is a need to reduce the noise of the CT images to precisely identify the cause of the disease [4].

High-intensity X-rays are used to capture high-quality or transparent images, but because of the high radiation dose [5], these rays can be harmful to the human body. A lower X-ray intensity does not affect the human body, but the CT images produced are of lower resolution and contrast and thus include noise in all physical measurements owing to the variability of statistical methods [6]. Obtaining such images with poor quality can be dangerous for the patient as the radiologist may not identify or observe the detailed information as required for accurate diagnosis and hence such CT images do not serve their purpose. It is evident that even great practitioners having high experience may not draw results from such CT images. Thus, there is a need to improve the quality of the images without losing any valuable data from the image. One of the most popular methods to suppress noise is the edge preservation-based noise reduction method [7–12]. In applying this method, the most important aspect is that the medical information, such as edges, corners, or internal information of structures, should not be lost [10–14]. Therefore, the present study explored newer method and compared with the outcomes of the methods suggested in the literature for denoising medical images.

2. Literature Review

The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has paved the way for researchers to provide improved solutions for diagnosis, classification, data accumulation, with unusual circumstances, or novel methodologies to handle certain eccentric cases. The CT scan was evaluated to be the best imaging modality for the identification, diagnosis, and classification of COVID-19 in the patients [15–20]. This development mainly included preliminary entries such as case study presentation, data collation, and data analysis and pattern recognition from the same. It also elucidated various procedures followed in the diagnosis of infection, while documenting their multiple variations as they occurred in different patients encountered [21–28]. The study provides tenable results about the distribution, predominance, and spread of COVID-19 lesions. Diagnosis and classification are cardinal elements when documenting the growth of a pandemic such as COVID-19. Wieclawek and Pietka [29] in their study, present a novel prior attention residual learning (PARL)-based framework for the identification of COVID-19 pneumonia patients with edified performance. The presented framework also provides the classification of various types of COVID-19 pneumonia. The methodology has significant efficacy for COVID-19 pneumonia detection and can be extended to other diseases as well, the paucity of comparative analysis from previous frameworks creates an unprepossessing impression [30]. A study by Hashem et al. [31] focuses on the classification and identification of CT scans by implementing a novel supervised neural network-based architecture. Although, in the proposed architecture, indices used to compare the results of the approach are limited, it remains cogent as the performance of the presented framework shows greater efficacy, and the ability to handle the weakly labeled data adds to its merits. A self-learning feature selection via guided Deep Forest (AFS-DF) is proposed to address the issue of CT scan classification and identification for
COVID-19 patients. A deep learning model was leveraged to learn and optimize the data. The competitive analysis performed with four standard machine learning methods could be supplanted by similar deep learning models, the proposed method obtains highly accurate and astute results. The lack of accurate diagnosis methods for low-dose CT scans is a challenge in COVID-19 diagnosis [32]. This was addressed in a study that aimed to classify, identify, and analyze the CT scans of COVID-19 patients via implementing deep learning to develop an ultra-low-dose CT examination. While the results show great efficacy in classifying lesions into GGO, crazy paving, CS, nodular infiltrates (NI), broncho-vascular thickening (BVT), and pleural effusion (PE), a detailed literature review and comprehensive comparative analysis could edify the significance of the proposed methodology [33–40].

CT scan denoising and image segmentation for enhanced diagnosis and classification of COVID-19 patients emphasizes a comparative niche type of diagnosis and classification methodology that has a focus on image segmentation and denoising, along with its various implemented algorithms [41–44]. The various denoising methods are studied for the problematic noise occurring in CT scans by reviewing the modified TV model, the adaptive TV method, the adaptive non-local total variation method, the method based on the higher-order natural image prior model, the Poisson reducing bilateral filter, the PURE-LET method, which is an unbiased assessment of the mean-squared difference between the original and estimated images as the Poisson unbiased risk estimator (PURE), which is defined in the Haar wavelet domain, and the variance stabilizing transform-based methods based on methodology overview, accuracy, execution time, and their advantage/disadvantage assessments. Gong et al. [45] proposed a novel framework for the enhanced image segmentation of COVID-19 pneumonia CT scans by implementing a convolutional neural–deep learning model, which was first fed noisy data, so the network learned and later fed actual data for image segmentation. The revolutionary task of introducing fully automated, accurate, and fast image segmentation for COVID-19 diagnosis via the implementation of a deep learning network, which also addresses the issue of the paucity of data for analysis by data stimulators, is performed in the latest literature by Zhou [46]. A brief summary of existing methods of image denoising using deep learning approaches is shown in Table 1.

| Reference | Objectives | Methods | Merit | Demerit |
|-----------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Byeongyong et al. (2017) [37] | Proposes novel approaches to combine NSS and CNN for image denotation, thereby functioning reliably in all types of images | First, 3D block is created by aggregating similar images. Then, after applying current denoising approach, block matching is done by pilot signal; the denoising function is structured by CNN | Efficient for both irregular images and repeating patterns. Considers local and global image characteristics | Multiple iterations are required, and denoising function creation is cumbersome via CNN. |
| Wangmeng et al. (2018) [38] | Understanding whether CNN can be successful; its excellence can cause fast, flexible, and non-blind denotation. Could it help restore? | Survey paper | Reveals how additive white noise may give CNN image denotation unsatisfactory results | Does not include new techniques such as genetic algorithms |
| Reference                  | Objectives                                      | Methods                                                                 | Merit                                               | Demerit                                                                 |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hamid et al. (2019) [39]   | Preserves image edges while removing noise by CNN method | The canny technique is first used to draw the corners, and then the unsampled shearlet converts noisy images into low-frequency sub bands and 2D band stacking obtains 3D blocks and then maintains a denotation of non-subsampled shearlet transform (NSST) coefficients that is the same as CNN | Edges are preserved                                   | Computing complexity and time will grow; NSST constants are identified as long |
| Haque et al. (2018) [40]   | Uses encoder–decoder to denoise and restore image | Encoder = CNN and decoder                                               | Better than auto decoder                             | Encoder functions and decoder functions can be used differently for future to check performance |
| Diego et al. (2019) [41]   | Uses graph methods to treat to local attributes of images that primitive CNN misses out. | Graphing algorithms map local noise via proposed architecture           | Local attributes identified                           | Selecting best graphing method is long trial-and-error process         |
| Islam et al. (2018) [42]   | Uses end-to-end to handle mixed noise robustly    | Uses end-to-end mapping for every noisy entity so handles Gaussian impulse mixed noise | Lightweight structure, thus quick computing and easy to install | Not very suitable for high-end processing due to lightweight structure |
| Elhoseny et al. (2019) [43] | Bio-optimization-based filters are used to improve the PSNR ratio | Swarm-based optimization is carried out utilizing Dragonfly (DF) and modified firefly bilateral filters and algorithms | Very robust in medical images                       | Application may or may not extend beyond medical images                |
| Tian et al. (2019) [44]    | Makes the CNN network more trained and efficient with less time and samples | Utilize batch normalization and residual learning                        | It is effective and can be used in medical images    | Application may or may not extend beyond medical images                |
| Gong et al. (2018) [45]    | Preserves features in PET scan while denoising image | Employs the training loss function to maintain image features, utilizing current data to train layers of last | Very practical and good results with real patient data | The app may or may not expand beyond PET scans, such as X-rays, sonography, etc. |
| Zhang et al. (2018) [46]   | Real-world noisy images or spatial variant noise handling | Includes a tunable input noise map                                       | More quickly handles wide variety of sounds and special noise | Not compared to other conventional and nonconventional denoising methods |
Table 1. Cont.

| Reference | Objectives | Methods | Merit | Demerit |
|-----------|------------|---------|-------|---------|
| Gondara et al. (2016) [47] | Uses autodecoders using deep learning networks on small-size images for denoising | Boot size image is created by combination of heterogeneous images | Handles high-cost computational issues and huge training sets | Re-dimensioning images decrease their quality of resolution, and the study is data-specific, with no suitable architecture to reuse the method |
| Tian et al. (2020) [48] | It addresses CNN networks that take long time to train and suffer from saturation of performance | Amalgamates two frameworks: renormalization of batch and BRDNet | Fixes the issue of internal shifting covariates and tiny mini-batch issues | This refers to a multi-method that may take more time and space than other alternatives |
| Yu et al. (2019) [49] | Denoises both level and multi-level noise with sequential reduction and escalation using CNN and U-net frameworks | Downscaling and upsampling layers of CNN-based U-net is modified to handle multiple parameters | Handles multiple parameters; less GPU capacity required | Continuous upscaling and downscaling reduces image resolution quality |

3. Materials and Methods

With the merits of various denoising methods using deep learning concepts, a denoising scheme is proposed where convolution neural networks (CNN) and batch normalization are utilized. A novel methodology proposed is based on the assumption that low-dose COVID-19 influenced CT images may be noisy. The proposed system uses a CNN approach with batch normalization to decrease noise from low-dose COVID-19 infected patient CT images. Low-dose CT scans generally include Gaussian noise or Poisson noise. Unlike other types of noise, this noise is spread evenly throughout the imaging plane, with density values that correspond to the normal distribution or Poisson distribution. Below, Equation (1) is a mathematical representation of the noisy low-dose COVID-19 CT image.

\[ X(x, y) = Y(x, y) + n(x, y) \]

where \( Y(x,y) \) is the original signal, \( n(x,y) \) is the added noise, and \( X(x,y) \) is the noisy image, with \((x,y)\) determining the pixel location in the world-view plane.

3.1. Network Architecture

Various network topologies may be used to extract a wide range of different features. This restored mixture of features helps in image denoising. In image denoising, extending the network to increase performance is desirable. Thus, as shown in Figure 1, a new network based on two interconnected networks is proposed. The interconnected network has two separate networks: the top network and the bottom network. The top layer contains residual learning (RL) and batch normalization (BN). The bottom network includes the BN, RL, and dilated convolutions. The proposed network’s computational cost will be greater to compensate for the broader receptive field. Consequently, we choose one network (the bottom network) for dilated convolutions. The 2–10 and 12–17 layers of the bottom network use dilated convolutions to capture additional context information while retaining efficiency. The data are normalized using BN at the 18 layers, giving the two sub-networks the identical distribution.
The top network (also known as the first network) has a depth of 20, and it is the most important network. This layer is made up of separate types of layers: (i) convolution, batch normalization, and parametric ReLU (rectified linear activation function); (ii) convolution and batch normalization. In the field of image processing, terminology such as convolution, batch normalization, and parametric rectified linear units (PReLU) all refers to the same idea [47]. Convolution, batch normalization, and parametric rectified linear units are all implemented in sequence when using notation such as convolution, batch normalization, and parametric ReLU. Convolution, batch normalization, and the parametric ReLU are between layers 1 and 18, while the convolution only layer exists between layers 19 and 20.

The second network is the lower network, and it has a depth of 17. The convolution, batch normalization, and parametric ReLU layers of the second network are placed at the first and eighteenth levels of the network. For layers 2–17, dilated convolutions are employed. Conv is the last tier in the component hierarchy. In contrast to the first network, the filter size for each successive layer is the same as in the first network. Layers 2–17, on the other hand, obtain more information from a wider range due to the dilation factor of 2. Image denoising with dilated convolutions can be conducted at a lower computing cost. Furthermore, dilated convolutions with two sub-networks could reduce the depth [47–50].

To enhance the denoising speed, the proposed model employs two sub-networks rather than a single large one, increasing the breadth rather than the depth of the network. It also applies BN to small-batch and internal covariate-shift issues, employs RL to prevent gradients from vanishing, and uses dilated convolutions to decrease computing costs [48].

### 3.2. Loss Function

The optimization technique of stochastic gradient descent is used to train deep neural networks. To keep track of the model’s error, it is necessary to perform regular calculations as part of the optimization process. Since the loss function must be selected to estimate the model’s loss and change the weights to minimize it, it is also known as an error function. Predictive modeling problems such as classification or regression need a specific loss function when utilizing neural network models. Aside from this, the output layer’s configuration must match the chosen loss function. The complete deep network may be considered as a composite non-linear multivariate function \( F(x) \) with a non-linear coefficient [51]. To train the parameters, in the following loss function, \( L_i(R(y_i)) \) represents the estimated residual noise learnt by the network model, \( (y_1 - x_i) \) represents the noise of
actual medical CT images, and \( X_i \) is the noisy medical CT image. Below, Equation (2) is the loss function \( L(\Theta) \):

\[
L(\Theta) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N} |R(X_i; \Theta) - (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)|^2_2
\]  

(2)

where \( \Theta \) is the training parameter, and \( \{-y\} \) is the training data set, which contains \( N \) pairs of training images (noisy image, clean image). In the context of regression tasks, the mean absolute error (or \( L1 \) regularization) is commonly employed. The average squared error between the labeled and predicted data is calculated. Absolute deviation from the predicted output is computed and expressed as a fraction of the total output.

3.3. Batch Normalization and Residual Learning

Batch normalization is a technique for training deep neural networks that involves normalizing the inputs to a layer for each mini-batch before training. It is because of this that these deep networks require the shortest amount of training time, therefore facilitating the learning process. The variance can be obtained with Equation (3) as

\[
\sigma^2_X = \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \right)^2 \right\}
\]  

(3)

To obtain the normalized data, the below operations as in Equation (4) can be performed.

\[
Rx = (X + \mu) / \sqrt{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}
\]  

(4)

where \( X \) is the noisy image and \( \mu \) is the mean value.

To obtain the reconstructed normalized data, the below operations in Equation (5) can be performed.

\[
Ry = \alpha X + \beta
\]  

(5)

where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are the parameters used to train the learning process.

To obtain the final reconstructed and noise residual image, a convolutional layer is processed using a \( 3 \times 3 \times 64 \) filter.

Assume that \( R(x) \) is an inner mapping that may be fitted by multiple thinly stacked layers, each of which represents an input. There is no distinction between hypothesizing that multiple nonlinear layers can asymptotically approximate complex functions and believing that they can do so for residual functions, i.e., assuming that the input and output are of the same dimensions. As a result, rather than expecting stacked layers to approximate \( R(x) \), we enable these layers to approximate a residual function \( F(x) = R(x) - x \) explicitly. As a result, the initial function becomes \( F(x) + x \). No matter how closely each form asymptotically approaches the necessary functions, the learning curve for each form may be different. The framework [52] of the residual network is shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2.** Residual network framework.

Because of the deterioration problem, it may be difficult to approximate identity mappings by using many nonlinear layers. Solvers can simply push weights in many nonlinear layers toward zero to obtain as close to identity mappings as possible when
Because of the deterioration problem, it may be difficult to approximate identity mappings as possible when utilizing residual learning reformulation. In this scenario, finding the perturbations with reference to an identity mapping should be less difficult for the solver than learning the optimal function from scratch.

3.4. Significance of Proposed Model

The proposed model has the benefit of combining two image denoising networks that are performance-complementary. The two most essential components of the first network, as illustrated in Figure 1, are BN and residual learning. Second, the BN dilated convolution and RL algorithms are merged to create a single neural network. According to Figure 1, the proposed model can predict additive white Gaussian noise with a standard deviation of 70 while delivering an unambiguous, clean image. The newly collected noise is then used to generate a clean image. The proposed denoising network comprises two separate sub-networks that work together to reduce the depth of the network while simultaneously increasing the number of features that may be captured. A reduced depth is achieved, as well as the absence of gradients that disappear or erupt. The multiple features can be extracted using different patch sizes. An illustration of feature extraction [52] is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Feature extraction using different patch sizes.

Second, the training data distribution is changed by the application of a convolutional kernel. When it comes to dealing with the problem, many individuals feel that BN is the most effective choice available to them. It is, however, ineffective at trace levels, limiting the range of settings in which it may be used. Many hardware devices have memory limitations in real-world applications, yet they are nevertheless capable of running programs with high levels of computational complexity. The third benefit is that it is well known that a deep network can extract characteristics with greater precision. A dense network, on the other hand, will result in the loss of some context. As a result, we employ dilated convolutions in the proposed model to widen the receptive field and, as a result, gather more context information than we would otherwise. Additionally, dilated convolutions require fewer layers to provide the same function as more layers, whereas more layers achieve the same purpose with fewer layers.

As seen in Figure 1, two-channel networks coupled with dilated convolution produce outstanding image denoising performance. The decreased network depth also prevents gradients from disappearing or increasing in size. This approach will decrease the com-
putting costs of the proposed model. Instead, the bottom network is composed entirely of dilated convolutions, which may help the two sub-networks to produce complementary features while simultaneously boosting the network’s generalization capacity. Dilated convolutions, from our perspective, perform similarly to deep networks in terms of expanding the receptive field area. The effect of the proposed model on the noisy image is shown in Figure 4, where Figure 4a is a noisy CT image and Figure 4b is a denoised CT image obtained using the proposed model.

Figure 4. (a) Noisy CT image; (b) denoised CT image based on proposed method.

4. Results and Discussion

The experimental results are tested on a given dataset [53] in the public domain that contains CT images. Some of the experimental results are shown in Figure 5. All information is recorded in DICOM format as 512 × 512-pixel grayscale images with a 16-bit depth. For ease of understanding, Figure 5a–c are represented as CT (1–3). The proposed algorithm is tested over noisy CT images that suffer from Gaussian noise. These noisy images are obtained with different noise levels: 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35. Figure 6 shows the noisy CT image dataset over the noise level of 25. To execute the proposed method, some parameters are set, e.g., the nonlocal means (NLM) contains a 9 × 9 patch size and the window search is 31 × 31. Similarly, in NSST and wavelet transform, the decomposition level is set as 4. For comparison with the proposed method, some similar and state-of-the-art methods are used, such as [5,7,10,11,13,14].

Figure 5. Original CT image dataset, (a) Noiseless CT1 image; (b) Noiseless CT2 image; (c) Noiseless CT3 image.
Figures 7–9 show the results of all existing methods that are used for the comparative study, as well as also showing the results of the proposed method. The results of NLM [5] are shown in Figures 7–9. The advantages of the NLM filter are to provide sharp and smooth results. Here, the results indicate that some small edges in high-contrast regions are not properly preserved. Hence, the target of our proposed algorithm is to preserve all details of edges, as well as reduce the noise as much as possible. Therefore, the NSST-based method of noise thresholding is incorporated with the NLM filter in our proposed method so that these missing details can be preserved.

Figure 6. Noisy input CT image dataset (noise level = 25). (a) Noisy CT1 image; (b) Noisy CT2 image; (c) Noisy CT3 image.

Figure 7. Results of CT image denoising, (a) Outcomes of Mingliang et al., 2016 [5]; (b) outcomes of Kuppusamy et al., 2019 [7]; (c) outcomes of Cheng et al., 2019 [10]; (d) outcomes of Zhao et al., 2019 [11]; (e) outcomes of Jomaa et al., 2018 [13]; (f) outcomes of Manoj and Singh, 2020 [14]; (g) outcomes of proposed method.
In Figures 7–9, the results of [5,7,10,11,13,14] and the proposed algorithm are shown, respectively. From Figures 7–9, it can be analyzed that the results of Mingliang et al., 2016 [5] are satisfactory, but in high-contrast areas, the noise suppression and edge preservation are not acceptable. It was also analyzed during the experimental evaluation that as the level of noise increases, the results of Mingliang et al., 2016 [5] become less satisfactory in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression. Figures 7–9 show that the results of Kuppusamy et al., 2019 [7] are adequate in most areas, but that the noise suppression
and edge preservation are not satisfactory in the high-contrast areas. When the findings of Kuppusamy et al., 2019 [7] were tested in an experimental setting, it was discovered that they were not adequate in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression when the level of background noise increased. However, the findings in Figures 7–9 demonstrate that the results of Cheng et al., 2019 [10] are good in most regions, but that the noise suppression and edge preservation are inadequate in high-contrast areas. In an experiment, it was observed that the findings of Zhao et al., 2019 [11] were insufficient in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression when the amount of background noise grew.

As shown in Figures 7–9, the results of Jomaa et al. [13] are satisfactory in most locations; however, the noise suppression and edge preservation are insufficient in high-contrast areas. When the quantity of background noise increased, it was discovered that the findings of Jomaa et al. [13] were insufficient in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression, according to the results of an experiment. However, as seen in the findings in Figures 7–9, the results of Manoj and Singh [14] in most places are good, but the noise suppression and edge preservation are inadequate in high-contrast areas. According to the results of an experiment, as the amount of background noise grew, it was revealed that the findings of Manoj and Singh [14] were insufficient in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression, and that the findings of [14] were insufficient in terms of noise suppression.

Figures 7–9 also show that the results of the proposed methodology are excellent in comparison to existing methods. The noise suppression and edge preservation in the high-contrast area are also satisfactory in comparison to existing methods. During the experimental assessment, it was also discovered that as the amount of noise increases, the results of proposed methodology remain adequate in terms of edge preservation and noise suppression. In terms of the protection of edges and noise reduction, it can be analyzed from visual inspection that our proposed algorithm provides better results much of the time. However, the naked eye is not sufficient to analyze the visual results. Hence, some performance metrics, such as the peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) and image quality index (IQI), are also used to analyze the outcomes. The result analysis in terms of PSNR and IQI are shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Table 2. PSNR of denoised images.

| Noise Level | Before Denoising | After Denoising | Proposed Method |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|             | [5] [13] [14] [7] [10] [11] |
| CT 1 image  |                  |                 |                 |
| 10          | 24.6             | 32.14 32.12 32.12 33.25 31.50 31.20 | 33.39           |
| 15          | 23.77            | 30.95 30.91 30.25 31.45 29.96 29.26 | 31.44           |
| 20          | 21.61            | 29.45 29.42 29.35 30.10 28.21 28.11 | 30.05           |
| 25          | 19.97            | 27.98 27.92 27.38 29.68 28.01 28.11 | 29.85           |
| 30          | 18.12            | 26.31 26.31 26.21 28.47 27.25 27.21 | 28.54           |
| 35          | 16.95            | 25.26 25.22 25.36 26.19 25.31 25.11 | 26.88           |
| CT 2 image  |                  |                 |                 |
| 10          | 23.93            | 31.54 31.51 31.14 32.12 30.98 30.28 | 32.47           |
| 15          | 23.18            | 30.87 30.17 30.17 30.64 29.42 29.22 | 31.05           |
| 20          | 21.03            | 28.95 28.25 28.25 29.08 28.47 28.27 | 29.53           |
| 25          | 20.53            | 28.48 28.28 28.18 28.64 27.26 27.16 | 28.96           |
| 30          | 19.65            | 27.69 27.29 27.19 28.03 26.17 26.12 | 28.11           |
| 35          | 17.58            | 25.83 25.33 25.13 26.96 25.34 25.24 | 26.97           |
Table 2. Cont.

| Noise Level | Before Denoising | After Denoising |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------|
|             | [5]   | [13] | [14] | [7]  | [10] | [11] | Proposed Method |
| CT 3 image  |       |      |      |      |      |      |                |
| 10          | 24.81 | 32.33| 32.43| 32.13| 33.19| 31.98| 31.28          |
| 15          | 23.65 | 31.29| 31.29| 31.19| 31.25| 30.67| 30.37          |
| 20          | 22.04 | 29.84| 29.14| 29.14| 30.98| 28.68| 28.38          |
| 25          | 19.05 | 27.15| 27.25| 27.25| 29.27| 28.34| 28.14          |
| 30          | 18.1  | 26.29| 26.22| 26.19| 28.54| 27.52| 27.12          |
| 35          | 15.95 | 24.36| 24.36| 24.16| 26.65| 24.64| 24.14          |
| CT 4 image  |       |      |      |      |      |      |                |
| 10          | 25.16 | 32.65| 32.45| 32.15| 33.65| 31.63| 31.13          |
| 15          | 23.72 | 31.35| 31.33| 31.15| 31.24| 29.26| 29.12          |
| 20          | 21.82 | 29.64| 29.62| 29.24| 30.19| 28.31| 28.11          |
| 25          | 19.38 | 27.45| 27.15| 27.25| 29.34| 28.72| 28.11          |
| 30          | 18.48 | 26.64| 26.14| 26.24| 28.21| 27.37| 27.31          |
| 35          | 17.1  | 25.39| 25.29| 25.19| 26.94| 25.61| 25.21          |

PSNR is used to compare noiseless and denoised images, where, if PSNR has a high value in any method in comparison to any other method, then this means that the method that obtained the high PSNR value is one of the best methods. IQI is also used to compare a clean image and a denoised image, and the method is considered the best if it obtains a high IQI value. The maximum value of IQI is 1. Tables 2 and 3 are the results of the proposed method and compared methods. Here, it can be analyzed that, most of the time, the proposed method gives better outcomes.

Table 3. IQI of denoised images.

| Noise Level | [5] | [13] | [14] | [7] | [10] | [11] | Proposed Method |
|-------------|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|-----------------|
| CT 1 image  |     |      |      |     |      |      |                |
| 10          | 0.9931 | 0.9911 | 0.9912 | 0.9911 | 0.9924 | 0.9914 | 0.9976          |
| 15          | 0.9534 | 0.9514 | 0.9856 | 0.9826 | 0.9762 | 0.9712 | 0.9865          |
| 20          | 0.9312 | 0.9312 | 0.9541 | 0.9531 | 0.9365 | 0.9315 | 0.9597          |
| 25          | 0.8972 | 0.8922 | 0.9165 | 0.9135 | 0.9174 | 0.9114 | 0.9248          |
| 30          | 0.8903 | 0.8913 | 0.8954 | 0.8934 | 0.8832 | 0.8822 | 0.8962          |
| 35          | 0.8894 | 0.8814 | 0.8762 | 0.8732 | 0.8614 | 0.8611 | 0.8747          |
| CT 2 image  |     |      |      |     |      |      |                |
| 10          | 0.9817 | 0.9814 | 0.9828 | 0.9818 | 0.9751 | 0.9721 | 0.9889          |
| 15          | 0.9789 | 0.9782 | 0.9794 | 0.9744 | 0.9745 | 0.9725 | 0.9831          |
| 20          | 0.9421 | 0.9411 | 0.9654 | 0.9634 | 0.9241 | 0.9221 | 0.9521          |
| 25          | 0.8452 | 0.8451 | 0.8684 | 0.8654 | 0.8922 | 0.8912 | 0.9047          |
| 30          | 0.8364 | 0.8361 | 0.8361 | 0.8351 | 0.8632 | 0.8612 | 0.8740          |
| 35          | 0.8189 | 0.8129 | 0.8314 | 0.8214 | 0.8614 | 0.8611 | 0.8694          |
Table 3. Cont.

| Noise Level | [5]     | [13]    | [14]    | [7]     | [10]    | [11]    | Proposed Method |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|
| CT 3 image  |         |         |         |         |         |         |                |
| 10          | 0.9874  | 0.9872  | 0.9812  | 0.9811  | 0.9914  | 0.9911  | 0.9965         |
| 15          | 0.9514  | 0.9512  | 0.9614  | 0.9611  | 0.9762  | 0.9732  | 0.9893         |
| 20          | 0.9423  | 0.9421  | 0.9591  | 0.9571  | 0.9432  | 0.9422  | 0.9614         |
| 25          | 0.9102  | 0.9101  | 0.9241  | 0.9231  | 0.9397  | 0.9391  | 0.9235         |
| 30          | 0.8964  | 0.8962  | 0.8931  | 0.8921  | 0.8942  | 0.8941  | 0.9131         |
| 35          | 0.8831  | 0.8830  | 0.8894  | 0.8884  | 0.8913  | 0.8911  | 0.8941         |
| CT 4 image  |         |         |         |         |         |         |                |
| 10          | 0.9871  | 0.9821  | 0.9974  | 0.9964  | 0.9954  | 0.9944  | 0.9979         |
| 15          | 0.9642  | 0.9632  | 0.9831  | 0.9821  | 0.9645  | 0.9641  | 0.9846         |
| 20          | 0.9409  | 0.9309  | 0.9641  | 0.9621  | 0.9469  | 0.9461  | 0.9698         |
| 25          | 0.9123  | 0.9113  | 0.9352  | 0.9322  | 0.9231  | 0.9221  | 0.9411         |
| 30          | 0.8991  | 0.8951  | 0.8978  | 0.8958  | 0.8945  | 0.8941  | 0.9006         |
| 35          | 0.8647  | 0.8637  | 0.8649  | 0.8629  | 0.8791  | 0.8790  | 0.8771         |

For further analysis, the intensity profile is tested between noise-free and filtered CT images, as shown in Figure 10. From Figure 10, it is clearly analyzed that the pixel fluctuation between the proposed method and the clean image is much less than the intensity over the line. In contrast, the other filtered image has more fluctuation against the line of intensity.

![Figure 10. Intensity profiles of original image against existing methods and the proposed framework, respectively. Intensity profile of [5] is result of Medical image denoising by parallel non-local means;](image-url)
Intensity profile of [7] is result of customized nonlocal restoration schemes with adaptive strength of smoothening for magnetic resonance images; Intensity profile of [10] is result of shearlet and guided filter based despeckling method; Intensity profile of [11] is result of Local activity-driven structural-preserving filtering; Intensity profile of [13] is result of multi-scale transform and non-local means filter; Intensity profile of [14] is result of multivariate model and its method noise thresholding.

5. Conclusions

This paper follows the method of noise-based Bayes thresholding in non-subsampled shearlet transform (NSST) and nonlocal means (NLM) filters. Great and satisfactory results were obtained using the proposed scheme for image denoising and edge preservation. The NLM filter and non-NLM techniques were used for comparison with the proposed framework. The proposed method’s outcomes are better when compared with the existing literature. We examined the result in terms of PSNR and IQI. Through the naked eye, the improvement in the result of the proposed scheme can be seen in comparison to previously existing methods. Hence, the proposed method works well in terms of visual analysis, performance metrics, and intensity profiles.
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