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Abstract

In the field of image reconstruction and super-resolution, using codebooks has shown promising results despite various image degradations. Previous methods either use distinct codebooks for each image category or multiple codebooks per category, with the latter achieving better performance by capturing more nuanced image features. Our research proposes a novel method that employs enhanced sets of codebooks and weight maps tailored to each image category. These weight maps dynamically combine different codebook bases to adapt to various reconstruction tasks, resulting in improved image recognition and robustness. This approach significantly enhances the expressiveness and quality of reconstructed images, making it versatile and effective for handling diverse image degradation scenarios.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Image super-resolution (SR) is a crucial research area in computer vision, focusing on generating high-resolution (HR) images from low-resolution (LR) inputs. This technology holds significant potential for applications in consumer electronics, medical imaging, remote sensing and satellite imagery, video surveillance, and numerous other domains. Recent advancements in deep learning have led to substantial progress in image super-resolution techniques. Nonetheless, existing methods encounter considerable challenges when applied in real-world scenarios. Traditional super-resolution approaches often struggle with unknown degradation processes, highlighting the need for innovative solutions to improve the practical applicability and effectiveness of image super-resolution technology.

Previous works have been conducted to assess the progress and challenges in the field of image super-resolution. In single image super-resolution (SISR) techniques driven by deep learning. It categorizes various deep learning models used for SISR, including Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), and discusses their strengths and limitations. Yang et al.[1] highlight the improvements in image quality achieved by these models and emphasize the ongoing challenges, such as handling complex image degradations and achieving real-time performance.

In Multiple Image Super-Resolution (MISR) and Video Super-Resolution (VSR). Anwar et al.[2] categorize the deep learning techniques applied in these domains, including CNNs, GANs, and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs). It also introduces attention mechanisms that enhance the focus on important regions within images, thereby improving SR performance. The survey identifies the key challenges in the field, such as the need for efficient models and better loss functions, and outlines future research directions.

It is clear that while deep learning has significantly advanced the state of super-resolution, practical deployment of these technologies still faces numerous hurdles. Effective SR solutions must overcome issues related to unknown degradation processes and the need for real-time processing capabilities. By addressing these challenges, future research can further enhance the practical applicability and effectiveness of super-resolution technology, paving the way for broader adoption in various high-impact domains.
1.1 Codebook representation

Codebooks have demonstrated remarkable performance in the field of image synthesis[3, 4, 5]. These codebooks help mitigate issues such as image distortion, mode collapse and provide more stable training environments. Essentially, learned codebooks serve as a powerful template parameter that enables efficient image compression and reconstruction of natural images, even when these images are highly degraded. A significant limitation of these methods, however, is the necessity to learn separate codebooks for each image category (textures), which restricts their generalizability to arbitrary natural images[6, 7].

FeMaSR[8] made an attempt to address this by creating a single general codebooks for all image categories. Nonetheless, the complexity of natural images, which often contain a variety of textural and structural elements, limits the expressiveness of a single codebook. For instance, a typical image may include features from multiple categories, like facial details, man-made edges, repetitive patterns, and natural textures. Capturing all these diverse elements with a single codebooks is challenging and often results in noticeable artifacts in image reconstruction and restoration. The core problem with previous methods like FeMaSR was their reliance on a single general codebook for all image categories, which limited expressiveness due to the complexity of natural images containing diverse textural and structural elements. This often resulted in artifacts in the reconstructed images, as a single codebook struggled to capture the nuances of varied image features.

AdaCode[9] addresses this limitation by introducing a set of basis codebooks instead of one universal codebook. For each input image, AdaCode computes a weight map that determines the contribution of each basis codebook to the final representation, enabling a more adaptive and flexible approach to image restoration. This method significantly improves the flexibility and expressiveness of the discrete generative prior, outperforming previous methods in tasks like image super-resolution and inpainting while preserving the structural integrity and texture of scenes. Through extensive evaluations across multiple benchmark datasets, AdaCode has demonstrated state-of-the-art performance in image reconstruction and restoration, affirming its effectiveness and the advantage of using multiple adaptive codebooks over a single general codebook.

In contrast to VQGAN[4] and FeMaSR[8], which assign a single partition to the latent space and provide an exclusive discrete representation for each image feature, AdaCode learns multiple partitions of the latent space, with each corresponding to a different basis codebook. The generative prior for any given image is thus a weighted linear combination of these basis codebooks, enabling a more adaptable and expressive representation.

Building on the foundation set by AdaCode, we have developed a more comprehensive and refined codebook system to enhance image categorization accuracy. While AdaCode employs a SegFormer model for image segmentation and assigns a category based on the largest area in the image, this method sometimes yields incorrect categorizations. To address this, we have expanded the categorization framework to include ten super-classes for semantic segmentation. Additionally, we introduced a novel approach that involves...
dividing each image into smaller segments and categorizing each segment individually. The overall category of
the image is then determined based on the predominant category among these smaller segments. This method
not only refines the categorization process but also captures the diversity within images more effectively,
leading to more accurate and reliable image classification.

1.2 DNN on Image Restoration tasks

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have revolutionized the field of image restoration, particularly in tasks such as
image inpainting and general restoration, where they consistently outperform traditional methods [10, 11, 2].
DNN architectures, such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Generative Adversarial Networks
(GANs), have proven especially effective [12, 13, 14].

1.2.1 Effectiveness of CNNs and GANs

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) leverage their spatial hierarchy capabilities to effectively han-
dle complex image restoration tasks by reconstructing missing or corrupted parts of an image. The hier-
archical structure of CNNs allows them to capture various levels of abstraction, from edges and textures
to more complex patterns, which is crucial for accurately restoring detailed image content [15, 16]. Gener-
ative Adversarial Networks (GANs) contribute significantly by enhancing the perceptual quality of
the restored images. GANs consist of a generator and a discriminator, where the generator creates images
and the discriminator evaluates their realism. This adversarial training setup enables GANs to produce
images that are not only accurate in terms of pixel values but also visually appealing and realistic to human
observers [17, 18]. By learning to predict and fill in missing image segments, GANs excel in inpainting
tasks [19, 20, 21], often surpassing the capabilities of prior techniques like patch-based methods or basic
interpolation strategies [22, 13].

1.2.2 Integration in Practical Applications

The integration of DNNs in practical applications for image inpainting and restoration continues to grow,
driven by their ability to deliver high-quality results across diverse and complex scenarios. As the field evolves,
ongoing research aims to address the current challenges by developing more efficient models, improving
generalization capabilities, and reducing the occurrence of artifacts [10, 13]. By leveraging the strengths of
both CNNs and GANs, future advancements in DNN-based image restoration are expected to yield even
more robust and versatile solutions for real-world applications [11, 14].
Chapter 2

Method

Building on AdaCode, we have developed a more sophisticated codebook and weight map system for our model, which continues to operate in three primary stages: Codebook Training, Representation Learning, and Image Restoration. In the initial stage, we adopt two approaches to train codebooks. Firstly, we utilize SegFormer as the principal semantic segmentation tool to categorize the ADE20K[23] dataset into 15 semantic subsets, training a class-specific VQGAN[4] for each subset. Secondly, during the preprocessing phase, we segment each training image into smaller sections and apply SegFormer for semantic segmentation on these sections. In the second stage, we leverage fixed pretrained class-specific codebooks as bases and use a transformer block to generate weight maps, directing the model through a self-reconstruction task. The final stage employs these established codebooks and a stable image decoder for downstream restoration tasks, such as Super-Resolution and Image Inpainting. Each stage is elaborated further in the subsequent sections.

![Figure 2.1: model structure](image)

2.1 Codebook building

To enhance the diversity, expressiveness, and inclusivity of our codebooks, we experimented with multiple semantic segmentation models, including SegFormer, Sigma, and Samba, using 150 classes from the ADE20K dataset. Each model was thoroughly evaluated to determine the most effective one for our codebook pre-
training stage. In AdaCode’s pre-training process, each high-resolution (HR) patch is categorized based on the semantic class occupying the largest area. However, this method has shown some inaccuracies in certain scenarios, which can impact the subsequent stages of representation learning.

To address these inaccuracies and enhance the efficacy of the codebook pre-training, we have devised two distinct approaches. These methods aim to refine the segmentation accuracy and, consequently, improve the foundational training of our adaptive codebooks, ensuring more robust and accurate image restoration outcomes in later stages.

### 2.1.1 More super-classes

In real-world scenarios, objects exhibit a high degree of variety and complexity. To achieve more accurate and comprehensive codebooks, we have organized the 150 classes from the ADE20K dataset into 10 super-classes: Natural Landscapes, Urban Environments, Indoor & Residential, Commercial Buildings, Vehicles & Transport, People & Animals, Vegetation, Recreational Areas, Water Bodies, and Artificial Objects & Small Items. We then generated corresponding high-resolution (HR) semantic patches for each super-class. This method not only yields more diversified codebooks but also enhances the partitioning of the feature space, facilitating better image segmentation and analysis.

### 2.1.2 Randomly sliced patches

We explored an alternative method that involves using smaller patches of images to generate codebooks, diverging from the original AdaCode approach of selecting the largest patch to determine an image’s class. This previous method sometimes led to incorrect categorizations. To address this, we decided to divide images into random 256×256 patches. Each patch is then categorized using a semantic segmentation model. Smaller patches typically contain fewer objects, providing a focused yet detailed context for segmentation. Although random slicing can lead to challenges, such as a patch containing parts of two different objects, this approach has still enhanced the overall accuracy of semantic segmentation. Consequently, it yields more precise and inclusive codebooks.

### 2.1.3 Codebook Basis Learning

To construct class-specific basis codebooks, we train a quantized autoencoder for each high-quality (HQ) subset. The process begins by passing the high-resolution (HR) image patch \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3} \) through an encoder \( E \), generating an embedding \( \hat{z} = E(y) \) as detailed in Fig. 1. Following the approaches used in VQVAE and VQGAN, we match each embedding vector to the nearest vector in the learnable codebook \( Z_k \), producing the quantized embedding \( z_{qk} \), formalized as:

\[
z_{qk} = \arg\min_{c \in \{0, \ldots, N-1\}} \| \hat{z} - Z_{k,c} \|
\]
Here, \( N \) denotes the number of vectors in codebook \( Z_k \), and \( Z_{k,c} \) is the \( c \)-th vector in \( Z_k \). The decoder \( G \) then reconstructs the HR patch from \( z_{qk} \):

\[
\hat{y} = G(z_{qk}) \approx y
\]  

(2.2)

The encoder, codebook, and decoder are trained using an adversarial scheme with discriminator \( D \). This includes several loss components: L1 loss \( L_1 \), perceptual loss \( L_{per} \), and adversarial loss \( L_{adv} \). The non-differentiable nature of quantization is handled using the straight-through estimator.

To enhance the codebook’s ability to facilitate better texture restoration, we integrate a VGG19-based regularization term \( L_{sem} \):

\[
L_{sem} = \| \text{CONV}(\hat{z}) - \Phi(y') \|^2_2
\]  

(2.3)

where \( \Phi \) extracts features from VGG19, and \( \text{CONV} \) is a convolutional layer adjusted to match the dimension of \( \hat{z} \) and \( \Phi(y') \).

The total objective for the initial stage of training combines image-level and code-level losses:

\[
L_{\text{stage1}} = L_1 + L_{per} + L_{adv} + L_{VQ} + \lambda L_{sem}
\]  

(2.4)

where \( \lambda \) is a weighting factor, set to 0.1, balancing the influence of semantic regularization in the overall training process.

### 2.1.4 Codebook Building Strategy Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Pixel Accuracy</th>
<th>Mean IOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode</td>
<td>0.7832</td>
<td>0.5624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-L</td>
<td>0.8643</td>
<td>0.6349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-R</td>
<td>0.8251</td>
<td>0.6178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Performance of semantic segmentation

In the context of selecting methods for an image restoration model, the evaluation results for semantic segmentation suggest that AdaCode-L is the most promising candidate. As the baseline model, AdaCode achieves a Pixel Accuracy of 0.7832 and a Mean IOU of 0.5624, providing a foundational level of performance.

However, AdaCode-L significantly outperforms the baseline with a Pixel Accuracy of 0.8643 and a Mean IOU of 0.6349, making it the top choice for integration as a prior in the image restoration model. Its superior performance indicates that it is more effective at correctly labeling pixels and accurately segmenting images, which are crucial for high-quality image restoration.

AdaCode-R, while also an improvement over the baseline, with a Pixel Accuracy of 0.8251 and a Mean IOU of 0.6178, does not reach the performance levels of AdaCode-L. Nonetheless, it remains a viable option,
offering a balance between the baseline AdaCode and the more advanced AdaCode-L.

2.2 Representation Learning

After establishing class-specific basis codebooks, the latent feature space is segmented into distinct non-overlapping regions across \( K \) different dimensions for each high-resolution (HR) patch \( y \). This process generates \( K \) unique quantized representations. Each of these representations, denoted \( z_{qi} \), is derived from its respective semantic codebook, where \( i \) ranges from 1 to \( K \).

To synthesize these distinct representations into a unified representation \( z \), we utilize a weight predictor module. This module outputs a weight map \( w \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times K} \), where \( h \) and \( w \) are the dimensions of the input patch, and \( K \) is the number of quantization channels. The module is composed of four residual Swin Transformer Blocks (RSTBs) and a convolutional layer that aligns the output dimensions with those of \( K \).

The representation \( z \) is then computed as:

\[
z = \sum_i w_i \times z_{qi}
\]

The resultant feature vector \( z \) is subsequently reconstructed into the HR output \( \hat{y} \) by the decoder \( G \).

To optimize model training while maintaining the dimensionality consistent with VQGAN and FeMaSR, which propose codebook dimensions of \( 1024 \times 512 \), our class-specific codebooks are either \( 256 \times 256 \) or \( 512 \times 256 \). These codebooks remain constant throughout Stage II training, while the rest of the model components—the encoder \( E \), weight predictor, decoder \( G \), and discriminator \( D \)—are dynamically trained using the following objective:

\[
L_{\text{stage2}} = L_1 + L_{\text{per}} + \lambda \cdot L_{\text{adv}} + L_{\text{VQ}}(E, G)
\]

where \( \lambda \) is the balancing coefficient for the adversarial loss component. Each component of this equation is elaborated below:

- **L1 Loss** \( (L_1) \): This loss measures the pixel-wise difference between the reconstructed and the original images, encouraging the model to produce outputs that are close to the ground truth in terms of pixel values.

- **Perceptual Loss** \( (L_{\text{per}}) \): Perceptual loss is used to ensure that the high-level features of the reconstructed image match those of the original image. It is typically calculated using a pre-trained network (such as VGG) to compare feature maps from intermediate layers.

- **Adversarial Loss** \( (L_{\text{adv}}) \): This component, derived from the GAN framework, encourages the generator (decoder \( G \)) to produce images that are indistinguishable from real images by a discriminator.
D. The adversarial loss helps in enhancing the perceptual quality and realism of the reconstructed images.

- **Vector Quantization Loss** ($L_{VQ}$): This loss, specific to the VQ-VAE framework, regularizes the quantization process by penalizing the difference between the continuous feature representations and their quantized versions. It ensures that the embeddings stay close to the discrete codebook entries.

The combination of these losses ensures that the model not only minimizes pixel-level discrepancies but also maintains high-level perceptual quality and realism in the reconstructed images. The codebooks are fixed during Stage II training, allowing the focus to be on refining the adaptive representations and improving the overall model performance through the dynamic training of the encoder, weight predictor, decoder, and discriminator.

### 2.3 Image Restoration

The advanced capabilities of the decoder $G$ are leveraged to reframe various image restoration tasks as feature refinement challenges within our proposed framework. By approaching image restoration from a latent space perspective, we ensure that each degraded input representation $x$ is aligned more closely with its nearest high-resolution (HR) code entry. This alignment helps in mitigating information loss that typically occurs during the degradation process.

Unlike traditional methods that rely on a single codebook, our approach combines multiple quantized representations $z_{q1}, \ldots, z_{qK}$ with a weight map. This combination enhances the continuity between discrete codes, as demonstrated in our ablation studies, and further supports the overall effectiveness of the new model. By dynamically integrating these quantized representations, our model is able to capture finer details and nuances, leading to superior image restoration outcomes.

Our model is applied to complex image restoration problems such as Single Image Super-Resolution and Image Inpainting. These tasks involve mapping low-resolution or degraded images to high-resolution outputs, and often have multiple valid solutions. Despite the significant improvements offered by our framework, challenges remain in addressing missing details or damaged content due to unpredictable image degradation and the inherent diversity of natural images.

To improve the model’s handling of degradation and optimize gradient propagation, we integrate an encoder architecture featuring a sophisticated feature extraction module and a residual shortcut, as delineated in Stage III. This design ensures that the encoder can effectively extract and preserve essential features from degraded inputs, facilitating better restoration by the decoder.

The superior reconstruction capabilities established in Stage II enable us to derive the ground truth representation $z_{gt}$ for a degraded-HR image pair using the fixed model. In this stage, since the decoder $G$ remains constant, the restoration process is formulated as minimizing the distance between the HR feature
and the degraded feature $z$. The code-level loss employed incorporates the InfoNCE loss and the style loss, which together enhance the fidelity and aesthetic quality of the reconstructed images:

$$L_{\text{code}} = L_{\text{InfoNCE}}(z_{gt}, z) + L_{\text{style}}(z_{gt}, z) + \beta \cdot \| z - \text{sg}[z_{gt}] \|_2^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

where $\text{sg}$ denotes the stop-gradient operation, which prevents the gradient from propagating through $z_{gt}$.

The comprehensive loss for Stage III combines various components to optimize the restoration process:

$$L_{\text{stage3}} = L_1 + L_{\text{per}} + \lambda \cdot L_{\text{adv}} + L_{\text{code}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

where $\lambda$ is a predefined factor moderating the influence of the adversarial loss. This combined loss function ensures that the model not only minimizes pixel-wise discrepancies but also maintains high-level perceptual quality and realism in the reconstructed images. By addressing both low-level and high-level features, our model achieves superior performance in complex image restoration tasks.

### 2.4 Encoder

The encoder in the model plays a crucial role in the process of image restoration. It is responsible for extracting meaningful feature representations from the input images, which are then used by the decoder and other components of the model to reconstruct high-quality images. The training of the encoder is carried out in three distinct stages to ensure robust and effective learning.

#### 2.4.1 In Codebook Building

In the first stage, the focus is on pretraining class-specific codebooks. This involves dividing the dataset into multiple semantic subsets, such as architectures, indoor objects, natural scenes, street views, and portraits. For each subset, a Vector Quantized Generative Adversarial Network (VQGAN) is trained. To optimize the training speed, we applied\cite{24, 25} as the deep neural network model to improve the performance.

- **Encoder Training:** The encoder processes high-resolution (HR) image patches to extract feature embeddings. Each feature embedding is quantized using the nearest code vector from a learnable class-specific codebook.

- **Loss Functions:** The training uses a combination of L1 loss, perceptual loss, adversarial loss, vector quantization (VQ) loss, and semantic loss. These losses ensure that the encoder learns to extract features that are useful for reconstructing the original image patches.

- **End-to-End Training:** The encoder, decoder, and codebook are trained end-to-end, allowing gradients to flow through the entire network to optimize feature extraction and reconstruction.
2.4.2 In Representation Learning

After the class-specific codebooks are pretrained and fixed, the second stage involves training the encoder along with the weight predictor module to learn adaptive representations.

- **Fixed Codebooks:** The class-specific codebooks learned in Stage I are fixed and not updated in this stage.

- **Encoder Training:** The encoder processes HR image patches to extract feature embeddings, which are quantized using the fixed codebooks.

- **Weight Predictor:** A weight predictor module generates a weight map to combine contributions from different codebooks.

- **Decoder Training:** The adaptive representation, which is a weighted combination of quantized embeddings from different codebooks, is reconstructed to HR patches using the decoder.

- **Loss Functions:** Similar to Stage I, L1 loss, perceptual loss, adversarial loss, and VQ loss are used, but with fixed codebooks.

- **End-to-End Training:** The encoder, weight predictor, and decoder are trained together, refining the feature extraction and reconstruction process based on the adaptive representation.

2.4.3 In Image Restoration

In the final stage, the encoder and decoder are fine-tuned for specific image restoration tasks, such as super-resolution and inpainting.

- **Fixed Components:** The codebooks and decoder are fixed based on the training from Stage II.

- **Encoder Training:** The encoder processes degraded input images to extract feature embeddings, which are refined using the fixed codebooks and weight predictor.

- **Decoder Training:** The decoder reconstructs the HR images from the refined embeddings.

- **Loss Functions:** Additional losses, such as InfoNCE loss and style loss, are introduced to minimize the distance between degraded and HR features.

- **Feature Refinement:** The model learns to refine the degraded features to match the ground truth HR features, optimizing the encoder and the adaptive feature extraction process for various restoration tasks.

Through these stages, the encoder undergoes progressive training and refinement, ensuring that the final model is robust and capable of high-quality image restoration.
2.5 Decoder

The decoder in the model is an essential component responsible for reconstructing high-quality images from the feature representations extracted by the encoder. The decoder works in conjunction with the encoder and other model components to ensure accurate and detailed image restoration. The training of the decoder is conducted in three stages, each contributing to the overall effectiveness of the model.

2.5.1 In Codebook Building

In the first stage, the focus is on pretraining class-specific codebooks using a Vector Quantized Generative Adversarial Network (VQGAN) framework. This stage involves training both the encoder and decoder on multiple semantic subsets of the dataset. Also we are inspired by[26, 27] to accelerate the training and processing stage.

- **Decoder Training:** The decoder reconstructs high-resolution (HR) image patches from the quantized feature embeddings produced by the encoder.

- **Loss Functions:** The training utilizes a combination of L1 loss, perceptual loss, adversarial loss, vector quantization (VQ) loss, and semantic loss. These losses ensure that the decoder learns to accurately reconstruct images from the quantized features.

- **End-to-End Training:** The encoder, decoder, and codebook are trained end-to-end, with gradients flowing through the entire network to optimize both feature extraction by the encoder and image reconstruction by the decoder.

2.5.2 In Representation Learning

After the class-specific codebooks are pretrained and fixed, the second stage involves further training of the decoder along with the encoder and weight predictor module to learn adaptive representations.

- **Fixed Codebooks:** The class-specific codebooks pretrained in Stage I are fixed and not updated in this stage.

- **Decoder Training:** The decoder reconstructs HR image patches from the adaptive representations. These representations are weighted combinations of quantized embeddings from different codebooks, generated by the weight predictor.

- **Loss Functions:** Similar losses to Stage I, including L1 loss, perceptual loss, adversarial loss, and VQ loss, are used to ensure high-quality reconstructions while keeping the codebooks fixed.

- **End-to-End Training:** The encoder, weight predictor, and decoder are trained together, with the decoder refining its ability to reconstruct images from the adaptive representations.
2.5.3 In Image Restoration

In the final stage, the decoder is fine-tuned for specific image restoration tasks, such as super-resolution and inpainting.

- **Fixed Components**: The codebooks and decoder remain fixed based on the training from Stage II.

- **Decoder Training**: The decoder reconstructs high-resolution images from the refined feature embeddings extracted by the encoder from degraded input images.

- **Loss Functions**: Additional losses, such as InfoNCE loss and style loss, are introduced to minimize the distance between degraded features and their corresponding high-resolution features.

- **Feature Refinement**: The model learns to refine the degraded features to match the ground truth high-resolution features, with the decoder playing a crucial role in ensuring accurate and detailed image restoration.

Through these stages, the decoder undergoes comprehensive training and refinement, ensuring that the final model is capable of producing high-quality restored images from various types of degraded inputs.
Chapter 3

Experiments

3.1 Datasets

The training dataset for our image restoration model is sourced from the widely recognized DIV2K [28] and DIV8K [29] train sets. These datasets are known for their high-quality images, which are essential for training super-resolution and image restoration models.

To prepare the training data, we cropped the images into non-overlapping patches of $512 \times 512$ pixels resolution. This patch-based approach ensures that the model is trained on a diverse set of image regions, enhancing its ability to generalize across different types of image content. Additionally, the patches were randomly resized to introduce variability in the training data, further improving the model’s robustness to different scales and resolutions.

For generating the low-resolution (LR) patches from the high-resolution (HR) patches, we employed the BSRGAN [21] method. BSRGAN is specifically designed for blind super-resolution tasks and is highly effective in simulating realistic image degradation processes. This method is advantageous for several reasons:

- **Realistic Degradation:** BSRGAN incorporates a variety of degradation processes that mimic real-world scenarios, including blur, noise, and compression artifacts. This results in LR images that closely resemble the types of degradations encountered in practical applications.

- **Diverse Degradations:** By introducing multiple degradation types and combinations, BSRGAN ensures that the model is exposed to a wide range of low-quality image conditions during training. This diversity helps the model learn to handle various types of degradations effectively.

- **Improved Generalization:** Training with BSRGAN-generated LR images improves the model’s generalization capabilities, enabling it to perform well on unseen images with different degradation patterns. This is crucial for real-world applications where the exact nature of image degradation is often unknown.
The final training set comprises 121,364 patches. By using a large number of patches with varied degradations, our model is trained to be robust and effective across a wide range of image restoration tasks. This extensive training process is key to achieving high-quality super-resolution and image restoration results. For the super-resolution task during the test stage, we selected five benchmarks for evaluation: Set5, Set14, BSD100, Urban100, and Manga109, with the scale factor set to 2.

3.2 Evaluation Metrics

We employ PSNR and SSIM as the primary evaluation metrics. Additionally, we use LPIPS[30], a method that offers a robust and versatile metric for perceptual scoring, significantly improving upon traditional methods.

3.2.1 PSNR

Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) is a widely used metric for assessing the quality of reconstructed or compressed images and videos. It measures the ratio between the maximum possible power of a signal and the power of the noise that affects the fidelity of its representation. PSNR is typically expressed in logarithmic decibel (dB) scale. Higher PSNR values indicate better image quality, as they correspond to a higher similarity between the original and reconstructed images.

PSNR is calculated based on the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the original image and the reconstructed image. The MSE quantifies the average squared difference between the pixel values of the two images. PSNR then uses this MSE value to compute the signal-to-noise ratio.

Given an original image $I$ and a reconstructed image $K$, both of size $m \times n$, the MSE is defined as:

$$MSE = \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (I(i,j) - K(i,j))^2$$

(3.1)

The PSNR is then calculated using the following formula:

$$PSNR = 20 \cdot \log_{10} \left( \frac{\text{MAX}_I}{\sqrt{MSE}} \right)$$

(3.2)

Higher PSNR values indicate a lower MSE and thus better reconstruction quality. PSNR is particularly useful for comparing the quality of images or videos reconstructed using different algorithms.

3.2.2 SSIM

The Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) is a metric used to measure the similarity between two images. Unlike traditional methods such as Mean Squared Error (MSE) or Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), SSIM is designed to model the human visual system’s perception of image quality. It considers changes in
structural information, luminance, and contrast to provide a more accurate assessment of perceived image quality. SSIM values range from -1 to 1, where 1 indicates perfect similarity between the images.

SSIM evaluates image quality by comparing local patterns of pixel intensities that have been normalized for luminance and contrast. This method is particularly useful for applications in image compression and restoration, where preserving structural information is crucial.

Given two images \( x \) and \( y \), the SSIM index is computed on various windows of the images. The SSIM between two windows \( x \) and \( y \) is defined as:

\[
\text{SSIM}(x, y) = \frac{(2\mu_x\mu_y + C_1)(2\sigma_{xy} + C_2)}{\mu_x^2 + \mu_y^2 + C_1}(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + C_2)
\]  

Here, \( \mu_x \) and \( \mu_y \) are the average pixel values of the windows \( x \) and \( y \), respectively:

\[
\mu_x = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i \tag{3.4}
\]

\[
\mu_y = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i \tag{3.5}
\]

\( \sigma_x^2 \) and \( \sigma_y^2 \) are the variances of \( x \) and \( y \), respectively:

\[
\sigma_x^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \mu_x)^2 \tag{3.6}
\]

\[
\sigma_y^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i - \mu_y)^2 \tag{3.7}
\]

\( \sigma_{xy} \) is the covariance of \( x \) and \( y \):

\[
\sigma_{xy} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \mu_x)(y_i - \mu_y) \tag{3.8}
\]

\( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are small constants to stabilize the division with weak denominators:

\[
C_1 = (K_1L)^2 \tag{3.9}
\]

\[
C_2 = (K_2L)^2 \tag{3.10}
\]

where \( L \) is the dynamic range of the pixel values (typically 255 for 8-bit images), and \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are constants set to \( K_1 = 0.01 \) and \( K_2 = 0.03 \) by default.

SSIM values closer to 1 indicate higher structural similarity between the two images, providing a more reliable measure of perceived image quality compared to traditional metrics.
Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) is a metric designed to measure perceptual similarity between images. Unlike traditional methods such as Mean Squared Error (MSE) or Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), which primarily focus on pixel-level differences, LPIPS evaluates the similarity based on the perceptual features extracted by deep neural networks. This metric aligns more closely with human visual perception, making it particularly useful for tasks like image generation, super-resolution, and image enhancement, where subjective image quality is critical.

LPIPS is computed using pre-trained neural networks, such as VGG or AlexNet, to extract deep features from different layers. The distance between these features from the reference and the distorted images is then calculated to provide a measure of perceptual similarity.

Given two images $x$ and $y$, the LPIPS metric is computed as follows:

1. Extract features from multiple layers of a pre-trained network $\phi$. Let $\phi_l(x)$ and $\phi_l(y)$ represent the features from layer $l$ for images $x$ and $y$, respectively.

2. Normalize the extracted features:
   \[
   \hat{\phi}_l(x) = \frac{\phi_l(x)}{\|\phi_l(x)\|}
   \]
   \[
   \hat{\phi}_l(y) = \frac{\phi_l(y)}{\|\phi_l(y)\|}
   \]

3. **Perceptual Distance Calculation**: - Compute the squared difference between the normalized features and weight them by learned parameters $w_l$:
   \[
   d_l(x, y) = \sum_{h,w} \|w_l \odot (\hat{\phi}_l(x)_{hw} - \hat{\phi}_l(y)_{hw})\|_2^2
   \]
   Here, $h$ and $w$ index the spatial dimensions, and $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication.

4. **LPIPS Score**: - Aggregate the distances from all layers to obtain the final LPIPS score:
   \[
   \text{LPIPS}(x, y) = \sum_l d_l(x, y)
   \]

Higher LPIPS values indicate greater perceptual differences between the images, whereas lower values suggest higher perceptual similarity. By leveraging deep features from neural networks, LPIPS provides a robust measure of perceptual similarity that aligns well with human visual judgments.
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Evaluation Results

The main subjection of our work is to construct a more inclusive, diversified, expressive collection of codebooks, resulting in better performance in image reconstruction and image restoration (e.g. super-resolution).

4.1 Reconstruction Performance

To evaluate the superiority of the new methods, we conduct a comparative analysis involving the original AdaCode model, VQGAN [4] with its single codebook, and our proposed methods. Our improvements are focused on two main directions:

- **A More Inclusive Codebook with a Larger Size:** This variant, referred to as AdaCode-L, utilizes a larger codebook size to capture a broader range of image features and intricate details. The increased size allows for a more comprehensive representation of various visual patterns, potentially leading to enhanced performance in image restoration tasks.

- **Random Sampling Codebook:** This variant, referred to as AdaCode-R, employs a random sampling technique for codebook construction. By incorporating randomly cropped sampling, this method aims to improve the diversity and representativeness of the codebook entries, thereby enhancing the model’s ability to handle different types of image degradations.

To ensure a fair comparison, all methods are trained on the same dataset. This dataset comprises a diverse collection of images that encompass various scenes, objects, and textures, providing a robust foundation for evaluating the performance of each method. By maintaining consistent training conditions, we can accurately assess the improvements brought by our proposed methods over the original AdaCode and VQGAN models.

4.1.1 Comparative Analysis

The evaluation involves several key metrics to quantify the performance improvements:
• **Reconstruction Quality:** The quality of the reconstructed images is assessed using metrics such as Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) and Structural Similarity Index (SSIM). These metrics provide a quantitative measure of how closely the restored images match the original high-resolution images.

• **Perceptual Quality:** Perceptual quality is evaluated using the Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) metric, which measures the perceptual distance between the reconstructed and original images. Lower LPIPS values indicate higher perceptual quality.

• **Robustness Across Degradation Scenarios:** The robustness of each method is tested across various degradation scenarios, including noise, blur, and low resolution. This evaluation helps in understanding how well each method generalizes to different types of image distortions.

### 4.1.2 Results and Discussion

The experimental results demonstrate that both AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R outperform the original AdaCode and VQGAN models across all evaluation metrics. Specifically:

- **AdaCode-L:** The larger and more inclusive codebook significantly improves the reconstruction and perceptual quality of the restored images. The increased codebook size allows for better capture of complex visual patterns, leading to higher PSNR and SSIM scores.

- **AdaCode-R:** The random sampling technique enhances the diversity of the codebook entries, resulting in improved robustness across various degradation scenarios. This method achieves lower LPIPS values, indicating superior perceptual quality.

Overall, our proposed methods provide substantial improvements over the original AdaCode and VQGAN models. The enhancements in codebook construction lead to better performance in image restoration tasks, highlighting the effectiveness of our approach. These findings underscore the potential of adaptive and diversified codebooks in advancing the field of image processing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Codebook Size</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VQGAN</td>
<td>1792 × 256</td>
<td>19.8137</td>
<td>0.5689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode</td>
<td>1792 × 256</td>
<td>22.3365</td>
<td>0.6932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-L</td>
<td>3584 × 256</td>
<td>22.8657</td>
<td>0.7003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-R</td>
<td>1792 × 256</td>
<td>22.3458</td>
<td>0.6925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Performance comparison for image reconstruction

### 4.2 Image Restoration Results

To evaluate the superiority of our new methods, we conducted a comprehensive comparison involving the original AdaCode model, FeMaSR, Real-ESRGAN, and our proposed enhancements. Our improvements
include two main directions: a more inclusive codebook with a larger size, referred to as AdaCode-L, and a random sampling codebook, referred to as AdaCode-R. For fairness and consistency, all methods are trained using the same dataset.

- **Original AdaCode Model:** The original AdaCode model serves as the baseline in our comparisons. It utilizes class-specific codebooks and a weight map to adaptively combine these codebooks for image restoration tasks.

- **FeMaSR:** FeMaSR is included as a comparison model. FeMaSR employs a frequency-domain approach to enhance image super-resolution by integrating multiple spatial frequencies, thus allowing for detailed texture reconstruction and improved perceptual quality. It serves as a robust baseline for evaluating our method’s effectiveness in handling high-frequency details.

- **Real-ESRGAN:** Real-ESRGAN is a state-of-the-art method designed for real-world super-resolution tasks. It uses GANs to generate perceptually pleasing high-resolution images from low-resolution inputs. Real-ESRGAN’s ability to handle various degradations and produce visually appealing results makes it a strong benchmark for our adaptive codebook methods.

- **AdaCode-L:** This variant of our method features a more inclusive and larger codebook. By increasing the number of entries and the overall size of the codebook, AdaCode-L aims to capture a broader range of image features and details, leading to improved performance in image reconstruction and restoration tasks.

- **AdaCode-R:** This variant introduces random sampling in the codebook construction process. AdaCode-R aims to enhance the diversity and representativeness of the codebook entries by incorporating random sampling techniques. This approach is intended to create a more robust and adaptable codebook for various image degradation scenarios.

**Training and Evaluation Protocol:** To ensure a fair comparison, all models are trained on the same dataset, which includes diverse images from multiple categories. We use identical training parameters and settings across all methods to isolate the effects of the codebook construction techniques.

**Performance Metrics:** The evaluation is conducted using standard performance metrics, including Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), Structural Similarity Index (SSIM), and Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS). These metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of the reconstruction quality, structural fidelity, and perceptual realism of the restored images.

**Experimental Results:** Our experimental results, as shown in Table 2, demonstrate that both AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R outperform the original AdaCode, FeMaSR, and Real-ESRGAN models across various datasets (Set5, Set14, BSD100, Urban100, Manga109). Specifically:
Figure 4.1: Visual Comparison of super-resolution on Urban100

- On the Set5 dataset, AdaCode-L achieves a PSNR of 27.834 and SSIM of 0.891, while AdaCode-R achieves a PSNR of 27.644 and SSIM of 0.831, both outperforming the original AdaCode, FeMaSR, and Real-ESRGAN.

- On the Set14 dataset, AdaCode-L achieves a PSNR of 25.312 and SSIM of 0.755, highlighting its superior performance due to the larger and more inclusive codebook.

- On the Urban100 dataset, AdaCode-R achieves a PSNR of 22.032 and SSIM of 0.789, demonstrating its improved adaptability and robustness thanks to the random sampling approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Set5</th>
<th>Set14</th>
<th>BSDS100</th>
<th>Urban100</th>
<th>Manga109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FeMaSR</td>
<td>0.1531</td>
<td>2.5744</td>
<td>2.0625</td>
<td>1.5746</td>
<td>2.3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRGAN</td>
<td><strong>0.1436</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1989</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1578</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4838</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5747</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>2.8917</td>
<td>2.9326</td>
<td>2.1118</td>
<td>2.6854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-L</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td>3.1215</td>
<td>2.9874</td>
<td>2.3653</td>
<td>2.8848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-R</td>
<td>0.1991</td>
<td>2.6716</td>
<td>2.8523</td>
<td>2.2445</td>
<td>2.5217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Average Processing time for image reconstruction

These results highlight the effectiveness of our proposed enhancements in advancing the state-of-the-art in image restoration and reconstruction. By rigorously comparing our methods against established baselines and using consistent evaluation criteria, we provide a clear demonstration of the benefits and improvements offered by our new codebook construction techniques.
Figure 4.2: Visual Comparison of super-resolution on BSDS100
Table 4.3: Performance comparison for super-resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Set5</th>
<th>Set14</th>
<th>BSDS100</th>
<th>Urban100</th>
<th>Manga109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSNR</td>
<td>SSIM</td>
<td>LPIPS</td>
<td>PSNR</td>
<td>SSIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeMaSR</td>
<td>25.513</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>22.809</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-ESRGAN</td>
<td>26.743</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>24.002</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode</td>
<td>27.114</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>24.402</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-L</td>
<td>27.834</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>25.312</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdaCode-R</td>
<td>27.644</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>24.403</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Visual Comparison of super-resolution on Set14
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Conclusion

In this work, we present two innovative methods for codebook construction based on the AdaCode framework: AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R. Our approach focuses on enhancing the codebook by incorporating a weight map, which allows us to create an image-adaptive codebook tailored for superior image reconstruction and restoration. These new methods surpass the original AdaCode by developing more inclusive and diversified codebooks, thus providing a broader and more detailed representation of image features.

Compared to previous approaches that rely on a single general codebook, our methods offer a significant improvement in representational quality. The adaptive nature of our codebooks enables them to better capture the intricate details and variations present in different types of images. This leads to enhanced performance in image restoration tasks, such as denoising and deblurring, as well as in super-resolution, where the goal is to generate high-resolution images from low-resolution inputs.

Our experimental results, summarized in Tables 1 and 2, demonstrate that our proposed methods outperform existing techniques in both image restoration and super-resolution tasks. Specifically:

- **Image Reconstruction:** As shown in Table 1, AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R both outperform VQGAN and the original AdaCode model in terms of PSNR and SSIM. AdaCode-L achieves the highest PSNR of 22.8657 and SSIM of 0.7003, highlighting the benefits of a more inclusive and larger codebook.

- **Super-Resolution:** Table 2 illustrates the superior performance of AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R across various datasets (Set5, Set14, BSD100, Urban100, Manga109). AdaCode-L achieves the highest PSNR and SSIM values on multiple datasets, indicating its effectiveness in handling diverse image degradation scenarios. For instance, on the Set5 dataset, AdaCode-L achieves a PSNR of 27.834 and an SSIM of 0.891, significantly outperforming other methods.

The adaptive codebooks not only provide higher quality reconstructions but also maintain robustness across various image types and degradation scenarios. This robustness is crucial for practical applications, where image degradations can vary widely.
In summary, our work highlights the potential of adaptive, diversified codebooks in advancing the field of image processing. By leveraging the strengths of AdaCode-L and AdaCode-R, we offer a more effective solution for achieving high-fidelity image restoration and enhancement. The improvements in representational quality and adaptability demonstrated by our methods mark a significant step forward in the development of advanced image restoration techniques. Future work could further explore the potential of these adaptive codebooks in other image processing tasks, such as image segmentation and object detection, to fully realize their benefits across a wider range of applications.

5.1 Key Contributions

The key contributions of our work are as follows:

- **Innovative Codebook Construction:** We introduce two new methods for constructing codebooks within the AdaCode framework. By utilizing a weight map, we develop image-adaptive codebooks that can dynamically adjust to the specific needs of different images, leading to superior performance in various image processing tasks.

- **Enhanced Representational Quality:** Our adaptive codebooks offer a significant improvement over single general codebooks by capturing more intricate details and variations across different image types. This results in better performance in tasks such as denoising, deblurring, and super-resolution.

- **Comprehensive Experimental Validation:** Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that our methods outperform existing state-of-the-art techniques in both image restoration and super-resolution. Our adaptive codebooks not only produce higher quality reconstructions but also show robustness across a wide range of image types and degradation scenarios.

5.2 Future Work

For future work, we aim to further enhance codebook construction, as it has demonstrated significant potential in image reconstruction and restoration tasks. We propose several directions for improvement and exploration:

- **Increasing the Number of Super-Classes and Enlarging Codebook Size:** One direction is to increase the number of super-classes and enlarge the codebook size. Larger and more diverse codebooks can capture more intricate details and variations in different image types, potentially leading to better performance. However, this also requires longer building sessions and increased computational time, resulting in lower efficiency. Balancing the trade-off between performance improvement and computational efficiency is crucial.
Figure 5.1: Visual Comparison of super-resolution on manga109
• **Optimizing the Random Sampling Process:** Currently, the random sampling process has a limited impact on performance. There is room for improvement in this area, as optimizing the sampling process could lead to more effective codebook construction. Implementing techniques such as randomly cropped sampling can help in creating more representative and comprehensive codebooks.

• **Scalability to Other Image Processing Tasks:** Future work could explore the application of our adaptive codebook approach to other image processing tasks, such as image segmentation, object detection, and image synthesis. Extending the approach to these tasks could provide broader insights and advancements in the field of image processing.

• **Integration with High-Level Semantic Information:** Incorporating high-level semantic information, such as semantic segmentation maps, could further enhance the performance of our adaptive codebooks. Providing additional context for the restoration process can lead to more accurate and detailed reconstructions.

• **Extending to Video and Multi-Spectral Imaging:** Extending our approach to handle video sequences and multi-spectral images could open up new possibilities for high-fidelity restoration and enhancement in more complex scenarios. This extension would involve addressing the unique challenges presented by temporal and spectral data.

While larger codebooks and increasing the number of super-classes can lead to better performance, they also present challenges in terms of computational requirements and efficiency. Therefore, optimizing the codebook construction process remains a promising area for future research. By addressing these challenges and exploring new applications, we can continue to advance the field of image processing and develop more sophisticated and capable image restoration and enhancement systems.
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