

# Theory of Generalized Fractal Transforms

Bruno Forte<sup>1,2</sup> and Edward R. Vrscay<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Facoltà di Scienze MM. FF. e NN. a Cà Vignal  
Università Degli Studi di Verona  
Strada Le Grazie  
37134 Verona, Italy  
e-mail: forte@biotech.univr.it

<sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics  
Faculty of Mathematics  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1  
e-mail: ervrscay@links.uwaterloo.ca

NATO ASI on Fractal Image Encoding and Analysis, 8-17 July, 1995, Trondheim, Norway

## Abstract

The most popular “fractal-based” algorithms for both the representation as well as compression of computer images have involved some implementation of the method of Iterated Function Systems (IFS) on complete metric spaces, e.g. IFS with probabilities (IFSP), Iterated Fuzzy Set Systems (IFZS), Fractal Transforms (FT), the Bath Fractal Transform (BFT) and IFS with grey-level maps (IFSM). (FT and BFT are special cases of IFSM.) The “IFS component” of these methods is a set of  $N$  contraction maps  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ ,  $w_i : X \rightarrow X$  over a complete metric space  $(X, d)$ , the “base space” representing the computer screen. Most discussions of these methods, both practical as well as theoretical in nature, assume that the sets  $w_i(X)$  are nonoverlapping (or at least ignore any overlapping), i.e. that  $w_i^{-1}(x)$  exists for only one value  $i^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . As such, given an image function  $u$ , its so-called *fractal transform*  $(Tu)(x)$  at any point  $x \in X$  is given by  $\phi_{i^*}(u(w_{i^*}^{-1}(x)))$  (where  $\phi_i : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  with appropriate restrictions). In the spirit of our earlier works, we consider the more general overlapping case, when  $x$  has more than one preimage, i.e.  $w_{i_k}^{-1}(x)$ ,  $1 < k \leq n(x)$ , and the question of how to combine the  $n(x)$  *fractal components*  $\phi_{i_k}(u(w_{i_k}^{-1}(x)))$  to form a *generalized* fractal transform  $(Tu)(x)$ . In this paper, we specify a set of rules for constructing such generalized fractal transforms, among them the condition that  $T$  be contractive with respect to the appropriate metric.

We also provide a unifying treatment of the various IFS-type methods over function spaces (IFS, IFZS, IFSM) and finally link them with IFSP over the probability measure space  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ . Firstly, we consider “traditional IFS” on  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  (the set of nonempty compact subsets of  $X$ ) as a fractal transform method over an appropriate function space. This provides the connection between IFS and IFZS which, in turn, leads to IFSM. The final link with IFSP on the probability measure space  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  is provided by a formulation of fractal transforms over  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ , the space of distributions on  $X$ . The IFSP and IFSM methods may then be considered as special cases of the distributional fractal transform.

**AMS Subject Classifications:** 41A, 41A35, 46E30, 65D15, 68U10

**Key words:** Iterated function systems, image representation, image compression, inverse problems

# 1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present a unified treatment of the various *fractal transform* methods for the representation and compression of computer images which have been based, in some way, on the method of Iterated Function Systems (IFS). These methods, which include “traditional” IFS and IFS with probabilities (IFSP), Iterated Fuzzy Set Systems (IFZS) and Iterated Function Systems with Maps (IFSM), along with variations, have been designed following a common pattern. Let  $(X, d)$  denote a complete metric space, the “base space” which may represent the computer screen, e.g.  $[0, 1], [0, 1]^2$  with Euclidean metric. The IFS component, consisting of  $N$  contraction maps,  $w_i : X \rightarrow X$ , will be written as  $\mathbf{w}$ . An image or target is then represented as a point in an appropriate complete metric space  $(Y, d_Y)$ . The metric spaces used in the various IFS-type methods are listed below:

**IFS [15, 2, 1]:**  $\mathcal{H}(X)$ , the set of nonempty compact subsets of  $X$ .

**IFZS [5]:**  $\mathcal{F}^*(X)$ , the set of all functions  $u : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  which are 1) upper semicontinuous on  $(X, d)$  and 2) normalized, i.e. for each  $u \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  there exists an  $x_0 \in X$  for which  $u(x_0) = 1$ .

**IFSM [12, 13, 10]:**  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$ , the space of  $p$ -integrable functions with respect to a measure  $\mu$ ,  $p \leq \infty$ . Fractal Transforms [4, 8, 9] are a special case of IFSM. The Bath Fractal Transform [19, 20] is an IFSM with place-dependent grey level maps.

**IFSP [15, 2]:**  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , the set of probability measures on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $X$ .

Along with the IFS maps  $\mathbf{w}$  (except in the case of IFS on  $\mathcal{H}(X)$ ) there is an associated set of functions  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N\}$ ,  $\phi_i : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , which satisfy conditions that depend on the particular metric space  $(Y, d_Y)$  being used. The pair of vectors  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  then determine a *fractal transform operator*  $T$  which is designed to map  $Y$  into itself. It is desirable that  $T$  be contractive on  $(Y, d_Y)$  so that it possesses a unique and globally attracting fixed point  $\bar{y} \in Y$ , i.e.  $T\bar{y} = \bar{y}$ . Given a  $u \in Y$ , its image  $Tu$  will be constructed for each point  $x \in X$  (or each subset  $S \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ ). Except in the case of IFSP (which is no longer considered for image representation), most practical as well as theoretical studies devise methods which either assume that the  $w_i(X)$  do not overlap, or at least ignore any such overlap. (Indeed, if  $(Tu)(x)$  is to exist for all  $x \in X$  and  $X$  is closed and not discrete or finite, then some sets  $w_i(X)$  *must* overlap with each other, if only at one point.) As a result, each point  $x \in X$  is considered to have only one preimage  $w_{i(x)}^{-1}(x) \in X$ . The value of the fractal transform of  $u$  at  $x \in w_i(X)$  is simply  $(Tu)(x) = \phi_i(u(w_i^{-1}(x)))$ .

In the spirit of our earlier work on IFS-type methods on function spaces, namely IFZS and IFSM, we consider the more general non-overlapping case when  $x$  has more than one preimage, i.e.  $w_{i_k}^{-1}(x)$ ,  $1 < k \leq n(x)$ . Naturally, there remains the question of how to combine the  $n(x)$  *fractal components*  $\phi_{i_k}(u(w_{i_k}^{-1}(x)))$ , to form our *generalized fractal transform*  $(Tu)(x)$ . In this

paper, we postulate a set of common rules for combining fractal components. Some of these rules were already considered in the development of IFZS [5]. Understandably, such a method of generalized fractal transforms may not necessarily be useful in the problem of fractal image compression since the coding of any region of an image with more than one fractal component is usually viewed as redundant and contrary to the goal of data compression. Our study, however, is based on a view of fractal transform methods as viable methods of approximating functions and measures in the same spirit as Fourier series/transforms, orthogonal function expansions and, more recently, wavelet expansions.

Previously [12], we compared briefly the various IFS-type methods before outlining a solution of the inverse problem for IFSM [13]. In this paper, we again consider all of these methods, but with the purpose of unifying them *under one common scheme*. The first step is to establish the IFS method, traditionally viewed as a method of geometrically constructing fractal-type sets in  $\mathcal{H}(X)$ , as a fractal transform method over an appropriate function space whose elements are *bitmap*, i.e. black and white, images. A method of representing images with varying grey levels is clearly desirable. There is a straightforward transition from this IFS approach to the method of IFZS which works with the grey level range  $[0,1]$ . In the overlapping case for IFZS, the prescription for combining several fractal components, namely the *supremum* operator, carries over from the IFS method. A modification of the IFZS method [10], motivated in part by restrictions associated with the Hausdorff metric, yields the method of IFSM on the function space  $\mathcal{L}^1(X)$ . It is then natural to consider IFSM on  $\mathcal{L}^p(X)$ .

The final step is to provide a link between the IFS, IFZS and IFSM methods on function spaces and the method of IFSP on the probability measure space  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ . This is accomplished by constructing an IFS-type fractal transform on the space of distributions  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ . IFSP and IFSM correspond to particular cases of this distributional IFS (DIFS). Another noteworthy result of this method is an expression for integrals of the form  $\int_X f(x)\bar{u}(x)dx$ , where  $\bar{u}$  denotes the fixed point of an IFSM. (This is analogous to the expression for integrals of functions with respect to an IFSP invariant measure.)

Finally, we mention that the theory described in this paper may be easily extended to the “block encoding” [17] or “Local IFS” methods [4] which are currently employed in fractal image compression. In these methods, the IFS maps are assumed to map subsets of  $X$ , the *domain* or *parent* blocks, to smaller subsets, the *range* or *child* blocks. In a followup paper presented at this conference (henceforth referred to as Paper II), we consider inverse problems for generalized fractal transforms.

## 2. The Theory of Generalized Fractal Transforms

In this section, we formally define generalized fractal transforms of image functions and provide a set of common rules for constructing such transforms from their fractal components. The mathematical setting is provided by the following ingredients:

1. **The base space:** denoted, as above, by  $(X, d)$ . The space representing the pixels; a compact subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Without loss of generality,  $X = [0, 1]^n$  with Euclidean metric.

2. **The IFS component:** For an  $N \in \mathbf{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ . In many cases we can relax the condition that the  $w_i$  be contraction maps on  $X$ . Note that different sets  $w_i(X)$  may overlap. The principal classes of IFS functions used are:

$Con(X) = \{w : X \rightarrow X \mid d(w(x), w(y)) \leq cd(x, y) \text{ for some } c \in [0, 1), \forall x, y \in X\}$ , the set of contraction maps on  $X$ .

$Con_1(X) \subset Con(X)$ : the set of one-to-one contraction maps on  $X$ .

$Aff_1(X)$ : the set of affine maps on  $X$  which are one-to-one. The representation of such maps in  $X = [0, 1]^n$  is given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix with nonzero determinant and  $\mathbf{b}$  is an  $n$ -vector. The Jacobian of the above transformation will be denoted by  $|J| = |\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_n|$ , where the  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

3. **The image function space:**  $\mathcal{F}(X) = \{u : X \rightarrow R_g \subseteq \mathbf{R}^+\}$ , the functions which will represent our images. The **grey level range**  $R_g$  will denote the range of a particular class of image functions used in a given fractal transform method. (In practical applications,  $R_g$  is bounded.)
4. **The grey level component:** Associated with the IFS maps  $\mathbf{w}$  will be a vector of  $N$  functions  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N\}$ ,  $\phi_i : R_g \rightarrow R_g$ . We may also consider  $\phi_i : R_g \times X \rightarrow R_g$ , i.e. “place-dependent” grey level maps. See, for example, Ref. [19, 10].
5. **The fractal components of  $u$**  will be given by  $f_i : X \rightarrow R_g$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , where

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_i(u(w_i^{-1}(x))), & x \in w_i(X), \\ 0, & x \notin w_i(X). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In other words, the fractal component  $f_i(x)$  represents a modified value of the grey level of  $u$  at the  $i$ th preimage of  $x$  (if it exists).

6. **The generalized fractal transform of  $u \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ :**  $F_k : [R_g]^k \rightarrow R_g$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , where

$$F_k(\mathbf{t}) = F_k(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k), \quad t_i \in R_g, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \quad (3)$$

The  $F_k$  combine the  $k$  distinct fractal components  $t_i = f_i(x)$  subject to conditions described below. The transform  $F_N$  defines an operator  $T : \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(X)$  that associates to each image function  $u \in \mathcal{F}(X)$  the image function  $v = Tu$ . The way in which the  $F_k$  combine the fractal components depends on the image function space used.

The grey level ranges and fractal transforms for IFZS and IFSM are given below.

**IFZS:**  $R_g = [0, 1]$ .  $F_N(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_N(x)\}$ .

**IFSM:**  $R_g = \mathbf{R}^+$ .  $F_N(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x)$ .

We now outline the properties which are to be satisfied by the fractal transform operators  $F_k$ . This discussion follows the same pattern discussed in [5] with some additional comments.

1.  $F_N(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) = F_N(t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}, \dots, t_{i_N})$ , where  $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_N\}$  is any permutation of the index set  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  (symmetry).
2.  $F_N(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) = F_2(F_{N-1}(t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}), t_N)$  (recursivity).

Properties 1 and 2 imply that

$$F_N(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) = F_2(F_2(F_2(\dots(F_2(t_1, t_2), t_3), t_4), \dots), t_N), \quad (4)$$

and, in particular, that  $F_2(F_2(t_1, t_2), t_3) = F_2(t_1, F_2(t_2, t_3))$ . In other words,  $F_2$  is an associative binary operation on  $\mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+$ . We shall let  $S$  denote such a binary operation and assume that it satisfies the following set of additional properties:

3.  $S : [R_g]^2 \rightarrow R_g$  is continuous.
4.  $S(0, y) = y$ ,  $\forall y \in R_g$ , i.e. 0 is an *identity* element; the combination of a pixel with brightness  $y > 0$  with one of zero brightness yields a pixel with brightness  $y$ .
5.  $S$  is nondecreasing, i.e.  $x_a < x_b$  implies that  $S(x_a, y) \leq S(x_b, y)$ ,  $\forall y \in R_g$ . The brighter a pixel, the brighter its combination with another pixel.
6.  $S(x, x) \geq x$ ,  $\forall x \in R_g$ ; the combination of two pixels of equal brightness should not result in a darker pixel.
7. For all  $y \in R_g$ ,  $S(s, y) = s$  for  $s = \sup z \in R_g$  ( $s$  may be infinite), i.e.  $s$  is the *annihilator*.

There is a representation theorem for topological semigroups on  $\mathbf{R}$  which will be useful for the construction of appropriate associative operators for our fractal transforms.

**Theorem 1** [18] *If  $S : [\mathbf{R}^+]^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$  satisfies Properties (1)-(7) above, then there exist:*

1. a discrete (finite or countably infinite) index set  $I$ ,
2. a sequence of disjoint open intervals  $\{(a_i, b_i)\} \subset \mathbf{R}^+$ ,  $i \in I$ , with  $0 = a_1 < b_1 \leq a_2 < b_2 \leq \dots$ ,
3. a sequence of numbers  $s_i \in \mathbf{R}^+$ ,  $i \in I$  and
4. a sequence of continuous and strictly increasing functions  $f_i : [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow [0, s_i]$ ,  $i \in I$ , with  $f_i(a_i) = 0$  and  $f_i(b_i) = s_i$ , such that

$$S(x, y) = g_i(f_i(x) + f_i(y)), \quad \forall (x, y) \in [a_i, b_i]^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $g_i : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, s_i]$ , the pseudoinverse of  $f_i$  is defined as

$$g_i(x) = \begin{cases} f_i^{-1}(x), & x \in [0, s_i], \\ b_i, & x \notin [s_i, \infty], \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and finally,

$$S(x, y) = \sup(x, y) \quad \text{if} \quad (x, y) \in [\bar{\mathbf{R}}^+]^2 - \bigcup_{i \in I} [a_i, b_i]^2. \quad (7)$$

### Examples:

1. With the condition that  $S(x, x) = x$  for all  $x \in R_g = [0, s] \subset \mathbf{R}^+$ , we have

$$S(x, y) = \sup\{x, y\} \quad \forall (x, y) \in [0, s]^2. \quad (8)$$

This represents an extreme case where the index set  $I = \{1\}$  and the sequence  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}$  reduces to the interval  $(0, s)$ . Then all  $x \in [0, s]$  are idempotents of  $S$ , with 0 being the identity and  $s$  the annihilator. This was the natural choice for the IFZS case [5].

2.  $S(x, x) = x$  for only  $x = 0$  or  $x = s$ . Again, there is only one interval  $(a, b) = (0, s)$ . If we choose  $f(x) = x$ , then

$$S(x, y) = \min\{x + y, s\} \quad \forall (x, y) \in [0, s]^2. \quad (9)$$

3.  $R_g = \mathbf{R}^+$ , i.e.  $s = \infty$ . A possible binary operation is the summation operator, i.e.

$$S(x, y) = x + y \quad \forall (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2. \quad (10)$$

The binary operation in Eq. (10) is employed by the IFSM method [12, 13, 10].

## 3. From IFS to IFSM Fractal Transforms

In this section, we construct a scheme to unify existing IFS-type fractal transforms on function spaces, as outlined in the Introduction. At the end we review the basic properties of IFSP on the space of probability measures  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , in preparation for Section 4, when fractal transforms of functions and IFSP are related through distributions. In what follows, we define the contraction factor of a map  $w \in \text{Con}(X)$  to be

$$c := \sup_{x, y \in X, x \neq y} d(w(x), w(y)) / d(x, y). \quad (11)$$

For an  $N$ -map IFS  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N)$ , the contraction factors of the  $w_i$  will be denoted by  $c_i$ . We then define  $c = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{c_i\}$ .

### 3.1 IFS

Here  $Y = \mathcal{H}(X)$ , the set of nonempty compact subsets of  $X$  and  $d_Y$  is the Hausdorff metric  $h$ , defined as follows. Let the distance between a point  $x \in X$  and a set  $S \in \mathcal{H}(X)$  be given by

$$d(x, S) = \inf_{z \in S} d(x, z). \quad (12)$$

Then for each  $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ ,

$$h(S_1, S_2) = \max\left\{\sup_{x \in S_1} d(x, S_2), \sup_{z \in S_2} d(z, S_1)\right\}. \quad (13)$$

Now let  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ ,  $w_i \in \text{Con}(X)$ . Associated with each contraction map  $w_i$  is a set-valued mapping  $\hat{w}_i : \mathcal{H}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(X)$  defined by  $\hat{w}_i(S) = \{w_i(x) | x \in S\}$  for  $S \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ . Then the usual IFS operator  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  associated with the  $N$ -map IFS  $\mathbf{w}$  is defined as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}(S) = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \hat{w}_i(S), \quad S \in \mathcal{H}(X). \quad (14)$$

The IFS operator  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  is contractive on  $(\mathcal{H}(X), h)$  [15]:

$$h(\hat{\mathbf{w}}(A), \hat{\mathbf{w}}(B)) \leq ch(A, B), \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{H}(X). \quad (15)$$

The completeness of  $(\mathcal{H}(X), h)$  guarantees the existence of a unique fixed point  $\bar{y} = A \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ . The set  $A$ , also called the *attractor*, is the IFS representation of an image. From Eq. (14), it satisfies the following self-tiling property,

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \hat{w}_i(A). \quad (16)$$

We now formulate the IFS method over an appropriate function space. First, let  $w_i \in \text{Aff}_1(X)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Let  $I_S(x)$  denote the characteristic function of a set  $S \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ , i.e.

$$I_S(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in S, \\ 1, & x \notin S. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Now let  $A, B \in \mathcal{H}(X)$  and  $C = A \cup B \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ . It follows that

$$I_C(x) = \sup\{I_A(x), I_B(x)\}. \quad (18)$$

From the property that  $I_{\hat{w}_i(S)}(x) = I_S(w_i^{-1}(x))$ , we then have, from Eq. (18),

$$I_{\hat{\mathbf{w}}(S)}(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{I_S(w_i^{-1}(x))\}. \quad (19)$$

Now consider the function space  $\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X)$  (for ‘‘black and white’’) defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X) = \{u : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \mid \text{supp}(u) \in \mathcal{H}(X)\}. \quad (20)$$

In this case, the support of  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(u) &= \{x \in X \mid u(x) = 1\} \\ &=: [u]^1, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where we have introduced the IFZS notation  $[u]^1$  to denote the “1-level” set of  $u$ . In other words,  $u$  represents a *bitmap* (black and white) image whose white region  $[u]^1$  is nonempty and closed. In fact,  $\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X) \subset \mathcal{F}^*(X)$ , the latter being the complete metric space on which IFZS is formulated. It is thus natural to consider the following metric on  $\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X)$ :

$$d_{BW}(u, v) = h([u]^1, [v]^1), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}^*. \quad (22)$$

The completeness of  $(\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X), d_{BW})$  follows from the completeness of  $(\mathcal{H}(X), h)$ . From Eq. (19), the generalized fractal transform operator  $T : \mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X)$  associated with the  $N$ -map IFS  $\mathbf{w}$  is given by

$$(Tu)(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{u(w_i^{-1}(x))\}, \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (23)$$

The contractivity of  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X), d_{BW})$  follows immediately from the contractivity of the IFS operator  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  on  $(\mathcal{H}(X), h)$ . Thus there exists a unique fixed point  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}^*(X)$  of the operator  $T$ , i.e.  $T\bar{u} = \bar{u}$ . Moreover,  $[\bar{u}]^1 = A$ , the attractor of the IFS  $\mathbf{w}$  so that

$$[\bar{u}]^1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \hat{w}_i([\bar{u}]^1). \quad (24)$$

In this formulation, pixels can assume only two grey level values, namely 0 and 1, or black and white (or vice versa). As such, only the geometry of an attractor is revealed. “Real” images, however, are not only black and white. Instead, their pixels can assume a range of nonnegative grey level values, e.g.  $u(x) \in [0, 1]$ . For this reason, it would be desirable to modify the above IFS method so that such a range of grey level values could be produced. This is easily accomplished by modifying the fractal components in Eq. (23) as follows:

$$(Tu)(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{\phi_i(u(w_i^{-1}(x)))\}, \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (25)$$

where the  $\phi_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are *grey level maps*. Subject to some conditions on these maps (which guarantee that  $T : \mathcal{F}^*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^*(X)$ ) we then arrive at the method of Iterated Fuzzy Set Systems (IFZS) [5].

### 3.2 IFZS

Here, images are represented by functions  $u \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  (cf. Section 1). The grey level range is  $R_g = [0, 1]$ . The metric  $d_Y$  for the space  $Y = \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  is defined as follows. We first define the  $\alpha$ -level sets of  $u \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} [u]^\alpha &:= \{x \in X : u(x) \geq \alpha\}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1], \\ [u]^0 &:= \overline{\{x \in X : u(x) > 0\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $\bar{S}$  denotes the closure of the set  $S$  in  $(X, d)$ . Clearly,  $[u]^\alpha \in \mathcal{H}(X)$  for  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ . Then for  $u, v \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$ , define

$$d_\infty(u, v) = \sup_{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1} h([u]^\alpha, [v]^\alpha). \quad (27)$$

The metric space  $(\mathcal{F}^*(X), d_\infty)$  is complete [6].

1. **The IFS component:**  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, \dots, w_N\}$ ,  $w_i \in \text{Con}(X)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ,
2. **The grey level component:**  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N\}$ ,  $\phi_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ :

(i)  $\phi_i$  is nondecreasing on  $[0, 1]$ ,

(ii)  $\phi_i$  is right continuous on  $[0, 1]$ ,

(iii)  $\phi_i(0) = 0$ .

In addition,

(iv)  $\phi_{i^*}(1) = 1$  for at least one  $i^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ .

The IFZS fractal transform  $T : \mathcal{F}^*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  is defined as

$$(Tu)(x) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{\phi_i(\tilde{u}(w_i^{-1}(x)))\}, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad (28)$$

where, for  $B \subseteq X$ , (i)  $\tilde{u}(B) = \sup_{z \in B} \{u(z)\}$  if  $B \neq \emptyset$  and (ii)  $\tilde{u}(\emptyset) = 0$ . The conditions imposed on the functions  $\phi_i$  guarantee that  $T$  maps  $(\mathcal{F}^*(X), d_\infty)$  to itself. The relation between level sets of a function  $u$  and those of its image  $Tu$  is given by

$$[Tu]^\alpha = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \hat{w}_i([\phi_i \circ u]^\alpha), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (29)$$

The contractivity of the IFS maps  $w_i$  implies that that  $T$  is a contraction map on  $(\mathcal{F}^*(X), d_\infty)$  since [5]

$$d_\infty(Tu, Tv) \leq cd_\infty(u, v), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{F}^*(X). \quad (30)$$

The completeness of this space guarantees the existence of a unique fixed point  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$  of the operator  $T$ . From Eq. (29), the  $\alpha$ -level sets of  $\bar{u}$  obey the following generalized self-tiling property:

$$[\bar{u}]^\alpha = \bigcup_{i=1}^N w_i([\phi_i \circ \bar{u}]^\alpha), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1], \quad (31)$$

which can be compared to the self tiling of  $\alpha = 1$ -level sets for the IFS case in Eq. (24).

We draw the reader's attention to the fact that the use of the *sup* operator in the IFZS operator  $T$  is a natural choice. The IFZS method is based on the properties of level sets of functions in  $\mathcal{F}^*(X)$ . Taking the *sup* of two functions  $u(x)$  and  $v(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  corresponds to taking the union of their respective  $\alpha$ -level sets.

The Hausdorff metric  $d_\infty$  is very restrictive, however, from both practical (i.e. image processing) as well as theoretical perspectives. In [10], two fundamental modifications were made to the IFZS approach:

1. For a  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  and  $u, v \in \mathcal{F}^*(X)$ , define  $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G(u, v; \alpha) &= \mu([u]^\alpha \Delta [v]^\alpha) \\ &= \int_X |I_{[u]^\alpha}(x) - I_{[v]^\alpha}(x)| d\mu(x), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where  $\Delta$  denotes the symmetric difference operator: For  $A, B \subseteq X$ ,  $A \Delta B = (A \cup B) - (A \cap B)$ .

2. Now let  $\nu$  be a finite measure on  $\mathcal{B}(R_g)$  and define

$$g(u, v; \nu) = \int_{R_g} G(u, v; \alpha) d\nu(\alpha). \quad (33)$$

An application of Fubini's Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v; \nu) &= \nu(\{0\})\mu([u]^0 \Delta [v]^0) + \int_{X_u} \nu((v(x), u(x))) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{X_v} \nu((u(x), v(x))) d\mu(x), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where  $X_u = \{x \in X \mid u(x) > v(x)\}$  and  $X_v = \{x \in X \mid v(x) > u(x)\}$ .

It can be shown that  $g(u, v; \nu)$  is a pseudometric on  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mu)$ . In the particular case that  $\nu = m$ , the Lebesgue measure on the grey level range  $R_g$ , Eq. (34) becomes

$$g(u, v; m) = \int_X |u(x) - v(x)| d\mu(x), \quad (35)$$

the  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mu)$  distance between  $u$  and  $v$ . The restrictive Hausdorff metric  $d_\infty$  over  $\alpha$ -level sets has been replaced by a weaker pseudometric (metric on the measure algebra) involving integrations over  $X$  and  $R_g$ . The result is a fractal transform method on the function space  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mu)$ . While it appears that only the  $\mathcal{L}^1$  distance can be generated by a measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{B}(R_g)$ , it is still natural to consider fractal transforms over the general function spaces  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$ .

### 3.3 IFSM

Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and for any integer  $p \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$  denote the linear space of all real-valued functions  $u$  such that  $u^p$  is integrable on  $(\mathcal{B}(X), \mu)$ . We choose  $Y = \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$ . The metric  $d_Y$  is defined by the usual  $\mathcal{L}^p$ -norm, i.e.  $d_Y(u, v) := d_p(u, v)$ , where

$$d_p(u, v) = \|u - v\|_p = \left[ \int_X |u(x) - v(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p}. \quad (36)$$

The IFSM is then defined by the following:

1. **The IFS component:**  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, \dots, w_N\}$ ,  $w_i \in Aff_1(X)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ,
2. **The grey level component:**  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N\}$ ,  $\phi_i \in Lip(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{R})$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} Lip(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{R}) &= \{\phi : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid |\phi(t_1) - \phi(t_2)| \leq K|t_1 - t_2|, \\ &\quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in \mathbf{R} \text{ for some } K \geq 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since our function space involves integrations, it is natural to define the following fractal transform operator  $T$  corresponding to an  $N$ -map IFSM  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$ :

$$(Tu)(x) := \sum_{k=1}^N f_k(x), \quad (38)$$

where the fractal components  $f_k$  are defined in Eq. (2). The above conditions on the  $w_i$  and  $\phi_i$  guarantee that  $T : \mathcal{L}^p(X, m) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^p(X, m)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , where  $m$  denotes Lebesgue measure on  $X$ .

Now let  $X = [0, 1]^D$ ,  $\mu = m$  and  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . Also let  $u, v \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, m)$  with fractal components  $f_k$  and  $g_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , respectively. Then from the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tu - Tv\|_p &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^N [f_k(x) - g_k(x)] \right\|_p \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^N \|f_k(x) - g_k(x)\|_p, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

we obtain the result

$$d_p(Tu, Tv) \leq C_p d_p(u, v), \quad C_p = \sum_{k=1}^N |J_k|^{1/p} K_k, \quad (40)$$

where  $|J_k|$  is the Jacobian associated with the affine transformation  $x = w_k(y)$ . In the special  $\mu$ -nonoverlapping case, i.e. where the sets  $w_i(X)$  overlap only on sets of zero  $\mu$ -measure (the standard assumption in practical applications in the literature), we may use the relation

$$\|Tu - Tv\|_p^p = \sum_{k=1}^N \|f_k(x) - g_k(x)\|_p^p \quad (41)$$

to obtain the result

$$d_p(Tu, Tv) \leq \bar{C}_p d_p(u, v), \quad \bar{C}_p = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N |J_k| K_k^p \right]^{1/p}. \quad (42)$$

Note that

$$\bar{C}_p \leq C_p \leq K, \quad K = \max_{1 \leq k \leq N} K_k. \quad (43)$$

In the nonoverlapping case, with  $p = \infty$ , we also have

$$\|Tu - Tv\|_\infty \leq K \|u - v\|_\infty, \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(X, m). \quad (44)$$

This is the usual bound presented in the literature on fractal transforms [4, 9].

In applications, we shall be using *affine IFSM*, i.e.  $w_k \in \text{Aff}_1(X)$  and

$$\phi_k(t) = \alpha_k t + \beta_k, \quad t \in \mathbf{R}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N. \quad (45)$$

If the associated operator  $T$  is contractive on  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$ , then its fixed point  $\bar{u}$  satisfies the equation

$$\bar{u}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N [\alpha_k \psi_k(x) + \beta_k \chi_k(x)], \quad (46)$$

where  $\psi_i(x) = \bar{u}(w_k^{-1})(x)$  and  $\chi_k(x) = I_{w_k(X)}$ . In other words,  $\bar{u}$  may be written as a linear combination of both functions  $\psi_k(x)$  and piecewise constant functions  $\chi_k(x)$  which are obtained by dilatations and translations of  $\bar{u}$  and  $I_X(x)$ , respectively. This is somewhat reminiscent of the role of scaling functions in wavelet theory.

The following result guarantees that the use of affine IFISM is sufficient from a theoretical perspective.

**Theorem 2** *Let  $X = [0, 1]^D$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ . For a  $p \geq 1$  define  $\mathcal{L}_A^p(X, \mu) \subset \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$  to be the set of fixed points  $\bar{u}$  of all contractive  $N$ -map affine IFISM  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  for  $N \geq 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_A^p(X, \mu)$  is dense in  $(\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu), d_p)$ .*

The proof of this theorem is based on the property that the set of all step functions in  $X$  is dense in  $(\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu), d_p)$ .

### 3.3.1 “Place-Dependent” IFISM

The above IFISM method may be easily generalized to “place-dependent” IFISM (PDIFISM), that is, IFISM with grey level maps having the form  $\phi_k : \mathbf{R} \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ . In other words, the  $\phi_i$  are dependent both on the grey-level value at a preimage as well as the location of the preimage itself. (This is analogous to IFS with place-dependent probabilities [3].) Much of the theory developed above for IFISM easily extends to place-dependent IFISM as we outline below. This is the basis of the “Bath Fractal Transform” and its effectiveness in coding images has been discussed in the literature [19, 20, 24].

The fractal components  $f_k(x)$  of a function  $u \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$  will be given by

$$f_k(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_k(u(w_k^{-1}(x)), w_k^{-1}(x)), & x \in w_k(X), \\ 0, & x \notin w_k(X). \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

The operator  $T$  associated with an  $N$ -map PDIFISM  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  will have the form

$$(Tu)(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \phi_k(u(w_k^{-1}(x)), w_k^{-1}(x)), \quad (48)$$

We first define the following set of uniformly Lipschitz functions,

$$\begin{aligned} Lip(\mathbf{R}, X; \mathbf{R}) = \{ \phi : \mathbf{R} \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{R} : |\phi(t_1, s) - \phi(t_2, s)| \leq K|t_1 - t_2|, \\ \forall t_1, t_2 \in \mathbf{R}, \forall s \in X \text{ for some } K \in [0, \infty) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

If  $w_i \in Aff_1(X)$  and  $\phi_i \in Lip(\mathbf{R}, X; \mathbf{R})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$  then  $T : \mathcal{L}^p(X, m) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^p(X, m)$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Furthermore, if  $X \subset \mathbf{R}^D$ ,  $D \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , and  $\mu = m$  then the relation in Eq. (40) holds.

Some possible forms for the place-dependent grey level maps  $\phi$  are as follows:

1.  $\phi(t, s) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i(s)t^i$ , where the  $a_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , bounded on  $X$ ,
2.  $\phi(t, s) = f(t) + g(s)$  (“separable”) with suitable conditions on  $f$  and  $g$ , e.g.  $f \in Lip(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{R})$  and  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  bounded on  $X$ .

It is convenient to work with  $\phi$  maps which are only first degree in the grey-level variable  $t$ , i.e.

$$\phi(t, s) = \alpha t + \beta + g(s), \quad g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \text{ bounded on } X, \quad (50)$$

$$\phi(t, s) = \alpha(s)t + \beta(s), \quad \alpha, \beta : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \text{ bounded on } X. \quad (51)$$

The action of the first set of maps can be considered as a “place-dependent” shift in grey-level value. The second set of maps produce a more direct interaction between position and grey-level value.

In Figure 1 are presented histogram approximations of fixed points  $\bar{u}$  of two rather simple affine PDIFSM in order to show the effects of place-dependence.

### 3.4 IFSP

Associated with an  $N$ -map IFS  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $w_i \in Con(X)$ , is a set of probabilities  $\mathbf{p} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ ,  $p_i \geq 0$ , with  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $X$  generated by all the elements of  $\mathcal{H}(X)$ . Then  $Y = \mathcal{M}(X)$ , the set of all probability measures on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ . Here, the (Markov) operator associated with the IFSP  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p})$  is defined as follows: For a  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  and each  $S \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ ,

$$(T\mu)(S) = (M\mu)(S) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \mu(w_i^{-1}(S)). \quad (52)$$

The metric  $d_Y$  on  $Y = \mathcal{M}(X)$  is the so-called Hutchinson metric  $d_H(\mu, \nu)$ :

$$d_H(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{f \in Lip_1(X)} \left[ \int_X f d\mu - \int_X f d\nu \right], \quad \forall \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X), \quad (53)$$

where

$$Lip_1(X : \mathbf{R}) = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq d(x_1, x_2), \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in X\}. \quad (54)$$

The contractivity of the IFS maps  $w_i$  implies the contractivity of  $M$  on  $(\mathcal{M}(X), d_H)$  [15]:

$$d_H(M\mu, M\nu) \leq c d_H(\mu, \nu), \quad \forall \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X). \quad (55)$$

Thus there exists a unique  $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{H}(X)$  such that (1)  $M\bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}$  and (2)  $d_H(M^n \mu, \bar{\mu}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover,  $supp(\bar{\mu}) \subseteq A$ , with the equality when all  $p_i > 0$ . From Eq. (52) it follows that

$$\bar{\mu}(S) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \bar{\mu}(w_i^{-1}(S)), \quad \forall S \in \mathcal{H}(X), \quad (56)$$

which leads to the following “change of variables” result for integration: For  $f \in C(X)$  (or simple functions),

$$\int_X f(x) d\bar{\mu}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \int_X (f \circ w_k)(x) d\bar{\mu}(x). \quad (57)$$

It is well known that by setting  $f(x) = x^n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , one can obtain recursion relations for the moments  $\bar{g}_n = \int_X x^n d\bar{\mu}$  of the invariant measure.

If we use the notation

$$\langle f, \mu \rangle := \int_X f(x) d\mu(x), \quad f \in C(X), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X), \quad (58)$$

then

$$\langle f, T\mu \rangle = \langle T^\dagger f, \mu \rangle, \quad (59)$$

where the adjoint operator  $T^\dagger : C(X) \rightarrow C(X)$  (referred to as  $T$  in [2]) is given by

$$(T^\dagger f)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i (f \circ w_i)(x). \quad (60)$$

We may iterate this procedure to obtain, for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, T^n \mu \rangle &= \langle (T^\dagger)^n f, \mu \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} \int_X (f \circ w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n})(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

For an  $x_0 \in X$ , let  $\mu = \delta_{x_0}$ , a Dirac unit mass at  $x_0$ . Since  $d_H(T^n \mu, \bar{\mu}) \rightarrow 0$ , one obtains

$$\int_X f(x) d\bar{\mu}(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} (f \circ w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n})(x_0). \quad (62)$$

This formula has been used to provide estimates for integrals involving  $\bar{\mu}$  which cannot be solved recursively. The computation of the multiple sums involve the enumeration of an  $N$ -tree to  $n$  generations.

By setting  $f(x) = I_S(x)$ , where  $S \subseteq X$ , the above relation becomes

$$\bar{\mu}(S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} I_S(w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n}(x_0)). \quad (63)$$

In Eq. (63), the term involving  $I_S$  indicates whether or not the point  $w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n}(x_0)$  lies in  $S$ . The quantity  $p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \dots p_{i_n}$  represents the probability of choosing the finite sequence  $\{\sigma_{i_1}, \sigma_{i_2}, \dots, \sigma_{i_n}\}$ . Therefore for each  $n > 0$ , the sum is equal to the probability that the point  $x_n$  lies in  $S$ .

There is a connection between Eq. (63) and the Random Iteration Algorithm or ‘‘Chaos Game’’ [1], defined as follows: Pick an  $x_0 \in X$  and define the iteration sequence

$$x_{n+1} = w_{\sigma_n}(x_n), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (64)$$

where the  $\sigma_n$  are chosen randomly and independently from the index set  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  with probabilities  $P(\sigma_n = i) = p_i$ . A straightforward coding argument shows that for almost every

code sequence  $\sigma = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots\}$  the orbit  $x_n$  is dense on the attractor  $A$  of the IFS  $\mathbf{w}$ . As such, the Chaos Game can be used to generate computer approximations of  $A$ . However, it also provides approximations to the invariant measure  $\bar{\mu}$  as a consequence of the following ergodic theorem for IFS [7]: For almost all code sequences  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n f(x_k) = \int_X f(x) \bar{\mu}(x) \quad (65)$$

for all continuous (and simple) functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . By setting  $f(x) = I_S(x)$  in Eq. (65) for an  $S \subseteq X$ , we obtain

$$\bar{\mu}(S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n I_S(x_k). \quad (66)$$

In other words,  $\bar{\mu}(S)$  is the limit of the relative visitation frequency of  $S$  during the chaos game.

#### 4. IFS on the Space of Distributions $\mathcal{D}'(X)$

In what follows  $X = [0, 1]$  although the extension to  $[0, 1]^n$  is straightforward. Distributions [21, 22, 23] are defined as linear functionals over a suitable space of “test functions”, to be denoted (following the standard notation in the literature) as  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ . In this paper,  $\mathcal{D}(X) = C_0^\infty(X)$ , the space of infinitely differentiable real-valued functions with compact support in  $X$ . The space of distributions on  $X$ , to be denoted as  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ , is the set of all bounded linear functionals on  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ , that is,  $F : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , such that

1.  $|F(\psi)| < \infty$  for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,
2.  $F(c_1\psi_1 + c_2\psi_2) = c_1F(\psi_1) + c_2F(\psi_2)$ ,  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ .

The space  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  will include the following as special cases:

1. Functions  $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, m)$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , for which the corresponding distributions are given by

$$F(\psi) = \int_X f(x)\psi(x)dx, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X), \quad (67)$$

2. Probability measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ , for which the corresponding distributions are given by

$$F(\psi) = \int_X \psi(x)d\mu(x), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X), \quad (68)$$

3. The “Dirac delta function”,  $\delta(x - a)$ , which may be defined in the distributional sense as follows: For a point  $a \in X$ ,  $F(\psi) = \psi(a)$  for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ . This is often written symbolically as

$$F(\psi) = \int_X \psi(x)\delta(x - a)dx. \quad (69)$$

Our goal is to construct an IFS-type fractal transform operator  $T : \mathcal{D}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$  which, under suitable conditions, will be contractive with respect to a given metric on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ . In the spirit of Section 2.1, the fractal components of a distribution  $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  would be defined (symbolically) as  $f_i(x) = \phi_i(u(w_i^{-1}(x)))$  and then combined to form  $T$ . Such a transform would serve to join the IFSM method over function spaces and the IFSP method over measure spaces under one common scheme.

The following property is very important in establishing a representation theory for distributions in  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ .

**Theorem 3** [23] *For any distribution/linear functional  $F \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ , there exists a sequence of test functions  $f_n \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , such that for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(\psi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n(x) \psi(x) dx \\ &=: F(\psi). \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

By recourse to this result, it will be convenient to express the linear functional  $F \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  symbolically as

$$\begin{aligned} F(\psi) &= \int_X f(x) \psi(x) dx \\ &= \langle \psi, f \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

even though there may not exist a pointwise function  $f(x)$  which defines the distribution  $F$ . The sequence of test functions  $f_n$  in the above theorem will then be said to converge to the distribution  $f$  “in the sense of distributions”. For notational convenience we shall write that “ $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ ”.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $w \in \text{Aff}_1(X)$  with Jacobian  $|J| \neq 0$  and  $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  with associated linear functional*

$$F(\psi) = \int_X u(x) \psi(x) dx, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X). \tag{72}$$

*Then the distribution  $v = u \circ w^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  may be defined (symbolically) as*

$$\begin{aligned} G(\psi) &= \int_X u(w^{-1}(x)) \psi(x) dx \\ &= |J| \int_X u(x) (\psi \circ w)(x) dx, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X). \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

**Proof:** Since  $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  there exists a sequence  $u_n \in \mathcal{D}(X)$  which converges to  $u$  in the sense of distributions, i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X u_n(x) \psi(x) dx = \int_X u(x) \psi(x) dx, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X). \tag{74}$$

For  $n \geq 1$  define  $v_n(x)$  as

$$v_n(x) = \begin{cases} u_n(w^{-1}(x)), & x \in \hat{w}(X), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

By the change of variable  $x = w(y)$  (with Jacobian  $|J| \neq 0$ ),

$$\int_X v_n(y)\psi(x)dx = |J| \int_X u_n(y)(\psi \circ w)(y)dy. \quad (76)$$

Since  $w$  is affine,  $\psi \circ w \in \mathcal{D}(X)$  for any  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ . Therefore for each  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X v_n(x)\psi(x)dx &= |J| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X u_n(y)(\psi \circ w)(y)dy \\ &= |J| \int_X u(y)(\psi \circ w)(y)dy, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

**Example:** Let  $w(x) = \frac{1}{2}x$  and  $u(x) = \delta(x)$ , the ‘‘Dirac delta function’’ at  $a = 0$ . Then  $u(w^{-1}(x)) = \delta(2x) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(x)$ .

**Definition 1** Let  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  and  $\{f_n\}$  any sequence in  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in the sense of distributions. Now let  $g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be such that

$$L(\psi) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X g(f_n(x))\psi(x)dx$$

exists for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$  independently of the sequence  $\{f_n\}$ . Then we define the distribution  $g \circ f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  in terms of the above limits, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, g \circ f \rangle &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X g(f_n(x))\psi(x)dx, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X) \\ &=: (G \circ F)(\psi). \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

If  $g$  is affine on  $\mathbf{R}$ , i.e.  $g(x) = ax + b$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ , then trivially the distribution  $g \circ f$  exists for all  $f \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ . Note, however, that if  $g$  is Lipschitz on  $\mathbf{R}$ , then the distribution  $g \circ f$  need not exist. For example,  $\sin(\delta(x))$  is not defined.

**Definition 2** A function  $g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  will be said to satisfy a weak Lipschitz condition on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  if there exists a  $K \geq 0$  such that for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,

$$\left| \int_X [(g \circ f_1)(x) - (g \circ f_2)(x)]\psi(x)dx \right| \leq K \left| \int_X [f_1(x) - f_2(x)]\psi(x)dx \right| \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{D}'(X). \quad (79)$$

If  $g$  is affine on  $\mathbf{R}$ , then it satisfies a weak Lipschitz condition on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ .

**Lemma 2** Let  $g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  satisfy a weak Lipschitz condition on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ . Then for any  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ ,  $g \circ f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  exists.

**Proof:** Let  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  and, from Theorem 1,  $f_n \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution. This implies that for any  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ , given an  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $M_\psi > 0$  such that

$$\left| \int_X [f_n(x) - f_m(x)]\psi(x)dx \right| < \epsilon, \quad \forall m, n \geq M_\psi. \quad (80)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_X [(g \circ f_n)(x) - (g \circ f_m)(x)]\psi(x)dx \right| &\leq K \left| \int_X [f_n(x) - f_m(x)]\psi(x)dx \right| \\ &\leq K\epsilon \quad \forall m, n \geq M_\psi, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

we may define, for each  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ ,

$$\int_X (g \circ f)(x)\psi(x)dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X (g \circ f_n)(x)\psi(x)dx. \quad \blacksquare \quad (82)$$

We now define an  $N$ -map IFS on Distributions (IFSD)  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  as follows:

1. **The IFS component:**  $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ ,  $w_i \in Aff_1(X)$ , with Jacobian  $|J_i| \neq 0$ ,
2. **The grey level component:**  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N\}$ ,  $\phi_i : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  satisfies a weak Lipschitz condition on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  (with Lipschitz constant  $K_i$ ).

An operator  $T : \mathcal{D}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$  will now be associated with this  $N$ -map IFSD. For any  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ , the distribution  $g = Tf$  will be defined by the linear functional

$$\begin{aligned} G(\psi) &= \int_X g(x)\psi(x)dx \\ &= \int_X (Tf)(x)\psi(x)dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_X (\phi_i \circ f \circ w_i^{-1})(x)\psi(x)dx. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

From Theorems 3 and 4, it follows that  $T$  maps  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  into itself. We now define the following metric on  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ :

$$d_D(f, g) = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_1(X)} \left| \int_X f(x)\psi(x)dx - \int_X g(x)\psi(x)dx \right|, \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{D}'(X). \quad (84)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_1(X) = C_0^\infty(X) \cap Lip_1(X; \mathbf{R})$ .

**Theorem 4** *The metric space  $(\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$  is complete.*

**Proof:** Let  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $(\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$ , that is, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $\bar{N}(\epsilon)$  such that  $d_D(f_m, f_n) < \epsilon$  for all  $m, n \geq \bar{N}(\epsilon)$ . From the definition of  $d_D$  in Eq. (84), it follows that for any fixed  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_1(X)$ , the sequence of real numbers  $\{t_n(\psi)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where

$$t_n(\psi) = \int_X f_n(x)\psi(x)dx, \quad (85)$$

is a Cauchy sequence on  $\mathbf{R}$ . Let  $\bar{t}(\psi)$  denote the limit of this sequence. By setting  $F(\psi) = \bar{t}(\psi)$  we define a bounded linear functional  $F$  on  $\mathcal{D}_1(X)$ . This procedure can easily be extended to all test functions  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(X)$  by noting that  $M^{-1}\psi \in C_0^\infty(X) \cap Lip_1(X; \mathbf{R})$ , where  $M \equiv \max_{x \in X} \psi'(x) < \infty$ . Therefore  $(\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$  is complete.

**Remark:** By restricting  $\mathcal{D}_1(X)$  to  $\mathcal{D}(X) \cap Lip_1(X; \mathbf{R})$  (as opposed to using the entire space  $C_0^\infty(X)$ ), we ensure that the set of Cauchy sequences in  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  is nonempty.

**Theorem 5** *Let  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  be an  $N$ -map IFSD,  $w_i \in Aff_1(X)$ . Then for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ ,*

$$d_D(Tf, Tg) \leq C_D d_D(f, g), \quad C_D = |J| \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| K_i \right], \quad (86)$$

where  $|J| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{|J_i|\}$ .

**Proof:** Let  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_X [(Tf)(x) - (Tg)(x)] \psi(x) dx \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{X_i} [\phi_i(f(w_i^{-1}(x))) - \phi_i(g(w_i^{-1}(x)))] \psi(x) dx \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| \int_X [\phi_i(f(y)) - \phi_i(g(y))] (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| \left| \int_X [\phi_i(f(y)) - \phi_i(g(y))] (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| K_i \left| \int_X [f(y) - g(y)] (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy \right| \\ &= |J| \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| K_i \left| \int_X [f(y) - g(y)] \rho_i(y) dy \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where  $\rho_i(x) = |J|^{-1}(\psi \circ w_i)(x) \in \mathcal{D}_1(X)$ . The desired result follows.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 1** *Let  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  be an  $N$ -map IFSD,  $w_i \in Aff_1(X)$ , such that*

$$C_D = |J| \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i| K_i < 1. \quad (88)$$

*Then there exists a unique distribution  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  such that  $T\bar{u} = \bar{u}$ , where  $T$  is the operator associated with the IFSD. Furthermore,  $d_D(T^n u, \bar{u}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ .*

#### 4.1 Affine IFSD and the Connection with IFSP and IFSM

We now consider the special case of affine IFSD  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  on  $X = [0, 1]$ . The IFS and grey level maps have the forms

$$w_i(x) = s_i x + a_i, \quad \phi_i(t) = \alpha_i t + \beta_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \quad (89)$$

with  $c_i = |s_i|$ . Given an operator  $T : \mathcal{D}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$  associated with an affine IFSD, an adjoint operator  $T^\dagger : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(X)$  may be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, Tf \rangle &= \langle T^\dagger \psi, f \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i c_i (\psi \circ w_i)(x) + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i c_i \int_X (\psi \circ w_i)(x) dx, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

In the special case that  $\alpha_i > 0$  and  $\beta_i = 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N c_i \alpha_i = 1$ , then  $T^\dagger$  becomes the adjoint operator on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  associated with the  $N$ -map IFSP  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p})$  with probabilities  $p_i = c_i \alpha_i$ , cf. Eq. (60). The associated IFSD operator  $T$  coincides with the Markov operator  $M$  on  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ . Note that the contraction factor of  $T$ , namely,  $C_D = |J|$ , also coincides with the contraction factor  $c$  of  $M$  in the  $d_H$  metric. This provides the connection between IFSD and IFSP.

Now let the fixed point distribution  $\bar{u}$  of an  $N$ -map affine IFSD be considered as a density function for a measure  $\bar{\mu}$  on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ , i.e.

$$\bar{\mu}(S) = \int_X I_S(x) \bar{u}(x) dx = \int_S \bar{u}(x) dx. \quad (91)$$

(Note that  $\bar{\mu}$  is not necessarily a probability measure although we may suitably rescale  $\bar{u}$  to make it so.) From Eq. (46),

$$\bar{\mu}(S) = \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k c_k \bar{\mu}(w_k^{-1}(S)) + \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k c_k m(w_k^{-1}(S)), \quad (92)$$

where  $m$  denotes Lebesgue measure. Again in the special case that  $\alpha_i > 0$  and  $\beta_i = 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i c_i = 1$ , Eq. (92) is identical to Eq. (56) for invariant measures of IFSP.

**Examples:** In all cases  $X = [0, 1]$  and  $N = 2$  with  $w_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}x$  and  $w_2(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ .

1.  $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t) = \frac{1}{2}t + \frac{1}{2}$ . The fractal transform  $T$  is contractive in  $(\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$  with contraction factor  $C_D = \frac{1}{4}$ . The fixed point  $\bar{u}(x) = 1$  is an element of  $\mathcal{D}'(X)$  as well as of  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, m)$  for all  $p \in [0, \infty]$ , since  $T$  is also contractive in  $(\mathcal{L}^p, d_p)$ .
2.  $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t) = \frac{1}{2}t$ . The fractal transform  $T$  is again contractive in  $(\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$  with  $C_D = \frac{1}{4}$ . Here,  $\bar{u}(x) = 0$ .
3.  $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t) = t$ . The fractal transform  $T$  is contractive in  $\mathcal{D}'(X), d_D)$  with  $C_D = \frac{1}{2}$ . However,  $T$  is not contractive in  $(\mathcal{L}^p, d_p)$ . In fact, the functions  $u(x) = c$  (a.e.),  $c \in \mathbf{R}$ , are fixed points of  $T$ . The fixed point attractor  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . In order to see this, let us take  $u_0(x) = \delta(x)$ , the Dirac delta function at  $x = 0$  and form the sequence  $u_{n+1} = Tu_n$ , for  $n \geq 0$ . From Eq. (83),  $u_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(x) + \frac{1}{2}\delta(x - \frac{1}{2})$  and

$$u_n(x) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \delta(x - \frac{k}{2^n}). \quad (93)$$

Let  $F_n$  denote the linear functionals associated with the  $u_n$ , i.e.  $F_n(\psi) = \int_X u_n(x) \psi(x) dx$ . Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(\psi) = \int_X \psi(x) dx$ .

## 4.2 Integrals Involving Affine DIFS

Let  $(\mathbf{w}, \Phi)$  be an  $N$ -map affine DIFS on  $X = [0, 1]$  as in Section 3.3, with associated operator  $T : \mathcal{D}'(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$ . Then if  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$  is defined by the linear functional  $F(\psi) = \langle \psi, f \rangle$ , the distribution  $g = Tf$  will be given by  $G(\psi)$ , where

$$G(\psi) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i c_i \int_X f(y) (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i c_i \int_X (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy \quad (94)$$

By iterating this procedure, we obtain, for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, T^n f \rangle &= \langle (T^\dagger)^n \psi, f \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} \int_X f(y) (\psi \circ w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n})(y) dy \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_{k-1}} q_{i_k} \int_X (\psi \circ w_{i_1} \circ w_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_k})(y) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where  $p_i = \alpha_i c_i$  and  $q_i = \beta_i c_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . (This result may be compared with the IFSP case in Eq. (61).)

If  $T$  is contractive then it possesses a fixed point  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ . Moreover,  $T^n f \rightarrow \bar{u}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution for any  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ . Setting  $f = \bar{u}$  and  $n = 1$  in Eq. (92), we obtain

$$\int_X \bar{u}(x) \psi(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i c_i \int_X \bar{u}(y) (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i c_i \int_X (\psi \circ w_i)(y) dy. \quad (96)$$

For example, in the case  $\psi(x) = x^n$ , we obtain a set of equations which permit the recursive computation of the moments  $g_n = \int_X x^n \bar{u}(x) dx$ . These equations necessarily coincide with those obtained from the IFSM method [10]. In the special case  $\beta_i = 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$ , we obtain the recursion equations for moments  $g_n$  of an invariant measure of the affine IFSP  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p})$  [10].

In general, however, integrals involving the fixed point  $\bar{u}$  can not be solved recursively or in closed form, e.g.  $\int_X x^{1/2} \bar{u}(x) dx$ . We may, however, use the fact that

$$\int_X \bar{u}(x) \psi(x) dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X (T^n f)(x) \psi(x) dx, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}'(X). \quad (97)$$

For an  $x_0 \in X$ , set  $f(x) = \delta(x - x_0)$ , the Dirac delta function at  $x_0$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X (T^n f)(x) \psi(x) dx &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n}^N p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} (\psi \circ w_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ w_{i_n})(x_0) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^N \alpha_{i_1} \dots \alpha_{i_{k-1}} \beta_{i_k} \int_{X_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k}} \psi(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where  $X_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k} = \hat{w}_{i_1} \circ \hat{w}_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ \hat{w}_{i_k}(X)$ . This expression is somewhat more complicated than Eq. (61), its counterpart for measures. However, the integrals are generally easy to compute.

As with Eq. (61), the evaluation of this expression involves the enumeration of  $N$ -trees to  $n$  generations.

**Example:** We consider the following 3-map affine IFSM:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(x) &= 0.4x, & \phi_1(t) &= t, \\ w_2(x) &= 0.4x + 0.3, & \phi_2(t) &= 0.25t + 0.25, \\ w_3(x) &= 0.4x + 0.6, & \phi_3(t) &= t. \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

The associated operator  $T$  is contractive in  $(\mathcal{L}^p(X, m), d_p)$  for  $p = 1$ . A histogram approximation of the attractor  $\bar{u}$  of this IFSM is shown in Figure 2. The power moments  $g_n$  of  $\bar{u}$ ,

$$g_n = \int_X x^n \bar{u}(x) dx, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \tag{100}$$

may be computed in closed form via Eq. (90) [10]. The first four moments are:

$$g_0 = 1, \quad g_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad g_2 = \frac{431}{1284}, \quad g_3 = \frac{217}{856}. \tag{101}$$

In Table 1 are shown approximations to these moments as well as to the integral  $g_{1/2} = \int_X x^{1/2} \bar{u}(x) dx$ , as computed from Eq. (98). (There is no closed form expression for  $g_{1/2}$ .) The convergence of the approximations with increasing  $n$  is evident. (The results for  $g_1$  are not shown since all approximations were in agreement to at least seven digits of accuracy.) Also note that the Hausdorff inequalities must be satisfied by the moments. In this case, we observe that  $g_0 > g_{1/2} > g_1 > g_2 > g_3$ .

## Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Prof. R. Strichartz for some valuable comments regarding distributions, especially for pointing out the “ $\sin(\delta(x))$ ” example. This research was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada (NSERC) in the form of individual Operating Grants as well as a Collaborative Projects Grant, all of which are gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- [1] M.F. Barnsley, *Fractals Everywhere*, Academic Press, New York (1988).
- [2] M.F. Barnsley and S. Demko, Iterated function systems and the global construction of fractals, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London* **A399**, 243-275 (1985).
- [3] M.F. Barnsley, S.G. Demko, J. Elton and J.S. Geronimo, Invariant measures for Markov processes arising from iterated function systems with place-dependent probabilities, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré* **24**, 367-394 (1988).
- [4] M.F. Barnsley and L.P. Hurd, *Fractal Image Compression*, A.K. Peters, Wellesley, Mass. (1993).
- [5] C.A. Cabrelli, B. Forte, U.M. Molter and E.R. Vrscay, Iterated Fuzzy Set Systems: a new approach to the inverse problem for fractals and other sets, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **171**, 79-100 (1992).
- [6] P. Diamond and P. Kloeden, Metric spaces of fuzzy sets, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **35**, 241-249 (1990).
- [7] J. Elton, An ergodic theorem for iterated maps, *Erg. Th. Dyn. Sys.* **7**, 481-488 (1987).
- [8] Y. Fisher, A discussion of fractal image compression, in *Chaos and Fractals, New Frontiers of Science*, H.-O. Peitgen, H. Jürgens and D. Saupe, Springer-Verlag (1994).
- [9] Y. Fisher, *Fractal Image Compression, Theory and Application*, Springer-Verlag (1995).

References [10]-[13] below are available via anonymous ftp from

[links.uwaterloo.ca:/pub/Fractals/Papers/Waterloo/\(name of paper - given at end of each reference\)](http://links.uwaterloo.ca/pub/Fractals/Papers/Waterloo/(name of paper - given at end of each reference))

- [10] B. Forte and E.R. Vrscay, Solving the inverse problem for functions and image approximation using iterated function systems, *Dyn. Cont. Impul. Sys.* (to appear in 1995). (forte95b)
- [11] B. Forte and E.R. Vrscay, Solving the inverse problem for measures using iterated function systems: A new approach, *Adv. Appl. Prob.* (to appear in 1995). (forte95a)
- [12] B. Forte and E.R. Vrscay, Solving the inverse problem for functions and image approximation using iterated function systems I. Theoretical Basis, *Fractals* **2**, 325-334 (1994). (forte94a)
- [13] B. Forte and E.R. Vrscay, Solving the inverse problem for functions and image approximation using iterated function systems II. Algorithm and computations, *Fractals* **2**, 335-346 (1994). (forte94b)

- [14] E. Hewitt and K. Stromberg, *Real and Abstract Analysis*, Springer Verlag, New York (1969).
- [15] J. Hutchinson, Fractals and self-similarity, *Indiana Univ. J. Math.* **30**, 713-747 (1981).
- [16] E.W. Jacobs, Y. Fisher and R.D. Ross, Image compression: A study of the iterated transform method, *Signal Processing* **29**, 251-263 (1992).
- [17] A. Jacquin, Image coding based on a fractal theory of iterated contractive image transformations, *IEEE Trans. Image Proc.* **1** 18-30 (1992).
- [18] C.-H. Ling, Representation of associative functions, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **12**, 189-212 (1965).
- [19] D.M. Monro, A hybrid fractal transform, *Proc. ICASSP* **5**, 162-172 (1993).
- [20] D.M. Monro and F. Dudbridge, Fractal Block Coding of Images, *Electron. Lett.* **28**, 1053-1054 (1992).
- [21] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill (1994).
- [22] L. Schwartz, *Théorie des distributions*, Second Edition, Hermann, Paris (1950).
- [23] R. Strichartz, *A Guide to Distribution Theory and Fourier Transforms*, CRC Press, Boca Raton (1994).
- [24] S.J. Woolley and D.M. Monro, Rate/distortion performance of fractal transforms for image compression, *Fractals* **2**, 395-398 (1994).