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ABSTRACT
This paper presents the constrained directional enhancement filter designed for the AV1 royalty-free video codec. The in-loop filter is based on a non-linear low-pass filter and is designed for vectorization efficiency. It takes into account the direction of edges and patterns being filtered. The filter works by identifying the direction of each block and then adaptively filtering with a high degree of control over the filter strength along the direction and across it. The proposed enhancement filter is shown to improve the quality of the Alliance for Open Media (AOM) AV1 and Thor video codecs in particular in low complexity configurations.

Index Terms—enhancement filter, directional filter, AV1

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of the in-loop constrained directional enhancement filter (CDEF) is to filter out coding artifacts while retaining the details of the image. In HEVC [1], the Sample Adaptive Offset (SAO) [2] algorithm achieves a similar goal by defining signal offsets for different classes of pixels. Unlike SAO, the approach we take in AV1 is that of a non-linear spatial filter. From the very beginning, the design of the filter was constrained to be easily vectorizable (i.e. implementable with SIMD operations), which was not the case for other non-linear filters like the median filter and the bilateral filter [3].

The CDEF design originates from the following observations. The amount of ringing artifacts in a coded image tends to be roughly proportional to the quantization step size. The amount of detail is a property of the input image, but the smallest detail actually retained in the quantized image tends to also be proportional to the quantization step size. For a given quantization step size, the amplitude of the ringing is generally less than the amplitude of the details.

CDEF works by identifying the direction [4] of each block (Sec. 2) and then adaptively filtering along the identified direction (Sec. 3) and to a lesser degree along directions rotated 45 degrees from the identified direction. The filter strengths are signaled explicitly, which allows a high degree of control over the blurring (Sec. 4). Sec. 5 demonstrates an efficient encoder search for the filter strengths, with results presented in Sec. 6.

2. DIRECTION SEARCH

The direction search operates on the reconstructed pixels, just after the deblocking filter. Since those pixels are available to the decoder, the directions require no signaling. The search operates on 8 x 8 blocks, which are small enough to adequately handle non-straight edges, while being large enough to reliably estimate directions when applied to a quantized image. Having a constant direction over an 8 x 8 region also makes vectorization of the filter easier.

For each block we determine the direction that best matches the pattern in the block by minimizing the sum of squared differences (SSD) between the quantized block and the closest perfectly directional block. A perfectly directional block is a block where all of the pixels along a line in one direction have the same value. For each direction, we assign a line number k to each pixel, as shown in Fig. 1.

For each direction d, the pixel average for line k is

\[ \mu_{d,k} = \frac{1}{N_{d,k}} \sum_{p \in P_{d,k}} x_p, \]

where \( x_p \) is the value of pixel p, \( P_{d,k} \) is the set of pixels in line k following direction d and \( N_{d,k} \) is the cardinality of \( P_{d,k} \) (for example, in Fig. 1, \( N_{1,0} = 2 \) and \( N_{1,4} = 8 \)). The SSD is then

\[ E_d^2 = \sum_k \left( \sum_{p \in P_{d,k}} (x_p - \mu_{d,k})^2 \right). \]

Substituting (1) into (2) and simplifying results in

\[ E_d^2 = \sum_p x_p^2 - \sum_k \frac{1}{N_{d,k}} \left( \sum_{p \in P_{d,k}} x_p \right)^2. \]

Note that the simplifications leading to (3) are the same as to those allowing a variance to be computed as \( \sigma^2 = \frac{\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2}{N-1} \). Considering that the first term of (3) is constant with respect to \( d \), we find the optimal direction \( d_{opt} \) by maximizing the second term:

\[ d_{opt} = \max_d s_d \]

\[ s_d = \frac{1}{N_{d,k}} \left( \sum_{p \in P_{d,k}} x_p \right)^2. \]
Algorithm 1: Direction search. The line_table[d][i][j] values are the line numbers shown in Fig. 1. The 840/count[d][L] terms can be pre-computed. More functionally equivalent algebraic simplifications are possible, but they are not shown here for clarity.

tap. The filter is parametrized by a strength $S$ and a damping $D$:

$$f (d, S, D) = \begin{cases} \min \left( d, \max \left( 0, S - \frac{d}{2^d - \log_2 S} \right) \right), & d \geq 0 \\ \max \left( d, \min \left( 0, \frac{1 - d}{2^d - \log_2 S} \right) - S \right), & d < 0 \end{cases}$$

(7)

with $D \geq \lceil \log_2 S \rceil$. The strength $S$ controls the maximum difference allowed and the damping $D$ controls the point where $f (d, S, D) = 0$. Fig. 3 illustrates the effect of the strength and damping on $f (\cdot)$. The function is anti-symmetric around $d = 0$.

3.1. Directional filter

The main reason for identifying the direction of the Section 2 is to align the filter taps along that direction to reduce ringing while preserving the directional edges or patterns. However, directional filtering alone sometimes cannot sufficiently reduce ringing. We also want to use filter taps on pixels that do not lie along the main direction. To reduce the risk of blurring, these extra taps are treated more conservatively. For this reason, CDEF defines primary taps and secondary taps. The primary taps follow the direction $d$, and the weights are shown in Fig. 4. For the primary taps, the weights alternate for every other strength, so that the weights for strengths 1, 3, 5, etc. are different from the weights for strengths 2, 4, 6, etc. The secondary taps form a cross, oriented 45° off the direction $d$ and their weights are shown in Fig. 5. The complete 2-D CDEF filter is expressed as

$$y (i, j) = x(i, j) + \text{round} \left( \sum_{m,n} w_{d,m,n}^{(p)} f \left( x(m, n) - x(i, j), S^{(p)}, D \right) \right) + \sum_{m,n} w_{d,m,n}^{(s)} f \left( x(m, n) - x(i, j), S^{(s)}, D \right) ,$$

(8)
**3.2. Valid strengths and damping values**

The strengths $S^{(p)}$ and $S^{(s)}$ and damping $D$ must be set high enough to smooth out coding artifacts, but low enough to avoid blurring details in the image. For 8-bit content $S^{(p)}$ ranges between 0 and 15, and $S^{(s)}$ can be 0, 1, 2 or 4. $D$ ranges from 3 to 6 for luma, and the damping value for chroma is always one less. $D$ shall never be lower than the $\log_2 S$ to ensure that the exponent of $2^{D-\lfloor \log_2 S \rfloor}$ in (7) never becomes negative. For instance, if for chroma $S^{(p)} = 15$ and the luma damping is 3, the chroma damping shall also be 3 (and not 2) because $\lfloor \log_2 S^{(p)} \rfloor = 3$.

For bit depths greater than 8 bits, $S^{(p)}$ and $S^{(s)}$ are scaled according to the extra bit depth, and $D$ is offset accordingly. For example, 12-bit content can have $S^{(p)}$ values of 0, 16, 32, ..., 240, and $D$ ranges from 7 to 10. The strengths are scaled up after selecting the primary filter taps, so the taps still alternate, even though the scaling makes all values of $S^{(p)}$ even. Picking the optimal damping value is less critical than picking the optimal strengths. $S^{(p)}$ and $S^{(s)}$ are chosen independently for luma and chroma.

The signaled luma primary strength $S^{(p)}$ is adjusted for each $8 \times 8$ block using the **directional contrast value** ($\nu$) computed in algorithm 1:

$$S^{(p)}_{adj} = \begin{cases} s^{(p)}(4+\min\left(\left\lfloor \log_2 \frac{2^{10}}{16} \right\rfloor, 12\right)) + 8, & v \geq 2^{10} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(13)

The adjustment makes the filtering adapt to the amount of directional contrast and requires no signaling.

**4. SIGNALING AND FILTER BLOCKS**

The frame is divided into filter blocks of $64 \times 64$ pixels. Some CDEF parameters are signaled at the frame level, and some may be signaled at the filter block level. The following is signaled at the frame level: the damping $D$ (2 bit), the number of bits used for filter block signaling (0-3, 2 bits), and a list of 1, 2, 4 or 8 **presets**. One preset contains the luma and chroma primary strengths (4 bits each), the luma and chroma secondary strengths (2 bits each), as well as the luma and chroma **skip condition bits**, for a total of 14 bits per preset. For each filter block, 0 to 3 bits are used to indicate which preset is used. The filter parameters are only coded for filter blocks that have some coded residual. Such “skipped” filter blocks have CDEF disabled. In filter blocks that do have some coded residual, any $8 \times 8$ block with no coded residual also has filtering disabled unless the skip condition bit is set in that filter block’s preset.

Since the skip condition flag would be redundant in the case when both the primary and secondary filter strengths are 0, this combination has a special meaning. In that case, the block shall be filtered with a primary filter strength equal to 19, a secondary filter strength equal to 7, and the skip condition still set.

When the chroma subsampling differs horizontally and vertically, e.g., for 4:2:2 video, the filter is disabled for chroma, and the
The goal is to find the two sets of presets (terms) and for each plane. Once the distortion values are computed, chroma secondary strength are not signaled.

\[
J = \lambda B \log_2 N + \sum_{b} \left( \min_{p \in P_{\text{luma}}} D_{b,p}^{\text{luma}} + \min_{p \in P_{\text{chroma}}} D_{b,p}^{\text{chroma}} \right),
\]

where \( N \) is the cardinality of \( P_{\text{luma}} \) and \( P_{\text{chroma}} \) and \( B \) is the number of filter blocks. While we are not aware of polynomial-time algorithms to find the global minimum, we have found that a greedy search can produce near-optimal results. With the greedy search, we start by finding the optimal presets for \( N = 1 \) and then increment \( N \) by finding the optimal preset to add while keeping the already-selected presets \( 1 \ldots N - 1 \) constant. If the encoder can afford the complexity, it is possible to improve on the purely greedy search by iteratively re-optimizing one preset at a time.

The high complexity version of the search described above typically results in less than 1% of the encoding time. Still, for low complexity operation, it is possible to reduce the search complexity by only considering a subset of the 128 possible presets. This results in only a small loss (<0.1% BD-rate) in quality.

The damping value may be determined from the quantizer alone, with larger damping values used for larger quantizers.

6. RESULTS

We tested CDEF with the Are We Compressed Yet [9] online testing tool using the AV1 and Thor [10, 11] codecs, both still in development at the time of writing. BD-rate results for PSNR, PSNR-HVS [12], CIEDE2000 [13], SSIM [8], and MS-SSIM [14] are shown in Table 1 for the objective-1-fast test set. These results reflect the gains in the codebases for git SHA’s (200b28 [15] (8th August 2017) and b5e5cc5 [16] (21st October 2017) for AV1 and Thor respectively.

Subjective tests conducted on AV1 for the high-latency configuration show a statistically significant (\( p < .05 \)) improvement for 3 out of 6 clips, as shown in Fig. 6. Considering that it usually takes in the order of 5% improvement in BD-rate to obtain such statistically significant results, and the tested configuration is the one with the smallest BD-rate improvement, we believe the visual improvement is higher than the BD-rate results suggest.

The objective results show that CDEF performs better when encoding with fewer tools and simpler search algorithms. In some sense, CDEF “competes” for the same gains as some other coding tools. Considering that CDEF is significantly less complex to encode than many of the AV1 tools, it provides a good way of reducing the complexity of an encoder. In terms of decoder complexity, CDEF represents between 3% and 10% of the AV1 decoder (depending on the configuration).

7. CONCLUSION

We have demonstrated CDEF, an effective in-loop filtering algorithm for removing coding artifacts in the AV1 and Thor video codecs. The filter is able to effectively remove artifacts without causing blurring through a combination of direction- adaptive filtering and a non-linear filter with signaled parameters. Objective results show a bit-rate reductions up to 4.5% on AV1 and 10.3% on Thor. These results are confirmed by subjective testing.

CDEF should be applicable to other video codecs as well as image codecs. In the case of AV1, an open question that remains is how to optimally combine its search with that of “Loop Restoration” [17], another in-loop enhancement filter in AV1.
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