Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model for Image Inpainting

Xin Feng, Wenjie Pei, Fengjun Li, Fanglin Chen, Member, IEEE, David Zhang, Life Fellow, IEEE and Guangming Lu, Member, IEEE

Abstract-Most existing methods for image inpainting focus on learning the intra-image priors from the known regions of the current input image to infer the content of the corrupted regions in the same image. While such methods perform well on images with small corrupted regions, it is challenging for these methods to deal with images with large corrupted area due to two potential limitations: 1) such methods tend to overfit each single training pair of images relying solely on the intra-image prior knowledge learned from the limited known area; 2) the interimage prior knowledge about the general distribution patterns of visual semantics, which can be transferred across images sharing similar semantics, is not exploited. In this paper, we propose the Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model (GM-SRM), which not only learns the intra-image priors from the known regions, but also distills the inter-image reasoning priors to infer the content of the corrupted regions. In particular, the proposed GM-SRM first pre-learns a generative memory from the whole training data to capture the semantic distribution patterns in a global view. Then the learned memory are leveraged to retrieve the matching inter-image priors for the current corrupted image to perform semantic reasoning during image inpainting. While the intra-image priors are used for guaranteeing the pixellevel content consistency, the inter-image priors are favorable for performing high-level semantic reasoning, which is particularly effective for inferring semantic content for large corrupted area. Extensive experiments on Paris Street View, CelebA-HQ, and Places2 benchmarks demonstrate that our GM-SRM outperforms the state-of-the-art methods for image inpainting in terms of both the visual quality and quantitative metrics.

Index Terms—Image inpainting, deep learning, generative memory, image synthesis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Image inpainting aims to infer the content of missing regions given a corrupted image. It serves as the essential technical step for many image processing tasks, such as oldphoto restoration [1] and image edit [2]. Image inpainting is challenging in that the predicted content for the missing regions is required to be consistent with the known regions at both the pixel level and the semantic level. Despite the significant progress for image inpainting made in recent years, image inpainting for images with large corrupted area remains an extremely challenging task.

Compared to the traditional techniques [3], [4] for image inpainting, deep learning methods based on convolutional neural networks have boosted the performance of image inpainting substantially due to its excellent capability of feature learning. Most existing deep learning methods [5], [6] for image inpainting follow the encoder-decoder framework, in which an encoder is designed to extract useful features from the known regions of the input image and then the decoder infers the content of the corrupted regions based on the encoded features. While such straightforward modeling way performs well for image inpainting with small corrupted regions, it can hardly deal with images with large corrupted area. This is largely because such methods focus on modeling the imageto-image mapping between the input corrupted image and the groundtruth intact image during training whereas the reasoning from the known regions to the corrupted regions is not explicitly learned.

To fully take advantage of the information of known regions for inferring the content of the corrupted regions, many methods for image inpainting [7]-[22] aim to learn effective prior knowledge from the known regions of the input image, and then infer the content of the corrupted regions based on such prior knowledge. These methods can be classified into four categories by the way of leveraging priors from the known regions. The first type of methods [7]–[9] employ attention mechanism to learn a confidence mask for the corrupted regions based on prior information of known regions, and then infer the pixel values of corrupted regions in a progressive propagation manner from high-confidence area to lowconfidence area. The second way of leveraging priors of known regions [10]–[13] is to predict the structure information of the corrupted regions from known regions first, namely the edge (high-frequency) information, then infer the detailed texture information under the guidance of the structure information. The prior knowledge of known regions can also be learned using VAE [23] by estimating the distribution of pixel values of the whole image based on known regions [21], [22]. Then the values of the corrupted regions can be inferred based on the obtained distribution. The last type of methods [14]–[20]perform constraints on the semantic consistency between the known regions and the predicted corrupted regions.

All aforementioned methods focus on modeling the imageto-image mapping and learning intra-image priors from the known regions of current input image to infer the content of the corrupted regions. Such modeling paradigm suffers from two potential limitations: 1) it tends to overfit each single training pair of images relying solely on intra-image reasoning

Xin Feng, Wenjie Pei, Fengjun Li, Fanglin Chen and Guangming Lu are with the Department of Computer Science, Harbin Institute of Technology at Shenzhen, Shenzhen 518057, China (e-mail: fengx_hit@outlook.com; wenjiecoder@outlook.com; 20s151173@stu.hit.edu.cn; chenfanglin@hit.edu.cn; luguangm@hit.edu.cn).

David Zhang is with the School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong at Shenzhen, Shenzhen 518172, China (e-mail: davidzhang@cuhk.edu.cn)

Manuscript received Xxxx xx, xxxx; revised Xxxx xx, xxx.

2



Fig. 1. Given an corrupted image, our *GM-SRM* infers the content for corrupted area by leveraging two types of priors during image restoring by the decoder (\mathbf{D}) : 1) intra-image priors learned from the known regions in the input image following the typical Encoder-Decoder framework (\mathbf{E} and \mathbf{D} in the figure), and 2) inter-image priors about the distribution patterns of visual semantics that can be transferred across images sharing similar semantics. Our *GM-SRM* distills the inter-image priors from the whole training data by learning a generative memory. The learned intra-image priors are used for pixel-level content inference while the inter-image priors are favorable for the high-level semantic reasoning. Consequently, our model is able to restore more reasonable image than other methods, such as DeepFill V2 [8] which only learns intra-image priors, or Lahiri *et al.* [24] which learns inter-image priors by simply pre-training the decoder as a image synthesizing network.

(from the known regions to the corrupted regions); 2) the interimage prior knowledge about the general distribution patterns of visual semantics, which can be generalized/transferred across similar images, is not exploited. For instance, similar objects or scenes from different but similar images always share similar texture. Besides, the spatial/structural associations among objects/sub-regions can be also distilled as priors to generalize across similar images. Lahiri et al. [24] made the first attempt to learn such general inter-image priors by pretraining the decoder in typical encoder-decoder framework as an image generative network under GAN [25] supervision. The pre-trained GAN captures the general semantic distribution, which is used to predict the content of the corrupted regions during decoding. However, such straightforward way emphasizes the importance of learning such general inter-image reasoning priors, but fails to coordinate and integrate the intraimage priors (from known regions within the same image) and the inter-image priors together. As a result, this method only shows limited effectiveness on images with small corrupted regions, but cannot handle cases with large corrupted regions. Figure 1 illustrates an example that such method cannot restore the corrupted regions smoothly and consistently.

In this paper, we propose the Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model (GM-SRM), which learns both the intra-image and inter-image reasoning priors to infer the content of the corrupted regions. Similar to most existing methods, the intra-image priors are learned from the known regions of the current input image by modeling the image-to-image mapping following the classical encoder-decoder framework. To distill the inter-image priors, our GM-SRM mines the general distribution patterns of visual semantic distributions. Such learned inter-image priors are then leveraged to perform inter-image semantic reasoning during image inpainting, which has two prominent advantages: 1) the learned priors enable our model to infer more diverse yet semantically reasonable content for the corrupted regions than the typical methods

relying solely on intra-image priors; 2) more importantly, the learned inter-image priors are particularly effective for inferring semantic content for large corrupted regions. To be specific, we draw inspiration from GLEAN [26], which learns realistic textures that can be generalized across images as priors for image super-resolution. Our proposed GM-SRM first pre-learns a generative memory from the whole corpus of training data to capture the semantic distributions in a global view. Then the learned memory is leveraged to guide the the process of image inpainting: it is favorable for performing high-level semantic reasoning while the classical encoderdecoder framework focuses on learning intra-image priors to guarantee mainly the low-level (like pixel-level) semantic consistency. As shown in Figure 1, our model is able to synthesize more reasonable content for the corrupted regions than other two methods. The main contributions of our GM-SRM are summarized as follows:

- A novel image inpainting framework is proposed to learn both the intra-image priors from known regions of the input image and inter-image priors from other images sharing similar semantic distributions, which are leveraged to infer the content of the corrupted regions that are consistent with the known regions at both the pixel level and high-level semantic level.
- We design a generative memory to learn the inter-image priors about the general distribution patterns of visual semantics, which can be seamlessly integrated into the classical encoder-decoder framework.
- We present the Conditional Stochastic Variation mechanism to generate noise conditioned on the information of the known regions, thereby synthesizing rich yet semantically reasonable textures during image inpainting.
- Extensive experiments on three benchmarks of image inpainting, including Paris Street view, CelebA-HQ and Places2, demonstrate both the quantitative and qualitative superiority of our proposed *GM-SRM* over other state-of-the-art methods for image inpainting, especially in

scenarios with large corrupted area.

II. RELATED WORK

There is a substantial amount of work on image inpainting. In this section, we review the most typical methods. Mainstream image inpainting methods can be roughly divided into two categories: traditional methods and deep learning methods. And deep learning methods for image inpainting can be further divided into intra-image prior based methods and inter-image prior based methods respectively.

Traditional methods. Earlier researches on image inpainting employ pixels of existing regions to directly fill in the missing regions, which can be divided into two categories, diffusion based methods and patch based methods. The diffusion based methods [3], [27] extend pixels at the boundary of corrupted regions to make the input complete, thus producing smooth content. However, this type of inpainting methods pay more attention to neighbor pixels of defects, and often perform well only on small corrupted areas. Aiming to solve such problems, the patch based methods [4], [28], [29] select the most likely patch from existing regions to replace the desired location. This type of methods can produce high-quality results on images with repeated textures. Nevertheless, it generates significant artifacts in the output due to the lack of global semantic understanding and generalization performance. In summary, traditional inpainting methods are difficult to satisfy nowadays demand of practical application.

Deep learning methods on learning intra-image priors. With great success of deep convolutional neural networks(CNNs) in various computer vision tasks, recent researches leverage deep CNNs to learn intra-image priors, and facilitate image inpainting. Main CNN-based methods for image inpainting employ known regions as priors to infer missing pixels from the outside to the inside. Pathak et al. [6] firstly propose a context-encoder framework to restore corrupted images in latent space. To further cope with irregular corruption, Liu et al. introduce the partial convolution(PConv) [7] to avoid blurry artifacts caused by traditional convolution. Inspired by attention mechanism [30], Yu et al. propose gated convolution(DeepFill V2) [8] to gradually learn soft masks rather than hard mask of PConv, and this enhances the inference reliability. Yu et al. believe features of known regions and inferred regions should be normalized respectively, thus proposing the region normalization(RN) [31] to improve inpainting performance. Li et al. [9] propose a recurrent framework to iteratively predict corrupted regions, and restored features are merged to infer output image.

To synthesize more plausible results, some researches estimate structure information to reconstruct unknown regions. For instance, Liu *et al.* [18] improve the attention mechanism by computing coherent semantic relevance to infer missing content. Nazeri *et al.* [10] predict edge maps to guarantee structure correctness and reuse edge maps to facilitate final image generation. Yang *et al.* [12] further integrate structure information with semantic information to enhance stability of image restoration. Xiong *et al.* [32] propose a foregroundaware framework that restores foreground objects of input image. Liu *et al.* [33] propose a mutual encoder-decoder framework to equalize the restoration of structure features and texture features. Though CNN-based methods have achieved promising performance to restore small corruption, larger continuous holes often lead to undesired results.

Recently, promoted by excellent generative representation ability of generative adversarial nets [25] and variation autoencoders [23], some researches attempt to employ them to improve the quality of synthesized images, and generate diverse content to fill in corrupted regions. Li *et al.* [34] propose a generative adversarial model to learn distribution representation of natural images, and thus can synthesize reasonable content from random noise. Zheng *et al.* [21] introduce the VAE to enhance diversity of generated content by posterior probability maximization. Later, Zhao *et al.* [22] propose a VAE based framework to improve diversity by the cooperation with randomly selecting instance images.

Deep learning methods on learning inter-image priors. Compared to learning intra-image priors, there are few researches based on learning inter-image priors. Lahiri *et al.* [24] pre-train a vanilla gan model as generative prior of the whole dataset, and then search effective information from the distribution space. Kelvin *et al.* [26] propose the GLEAN framework to learn generative priors for synthesizing realistic textures in image super-resolution task. However, current interimage prior based methods fail to restore images with complex content, and only work well on small corruption due to the weakness of pixel-level content inference. Hence, our *GM-SRM* combines the pixel-level content inference and high-level semantic reasoning by learning the inter-image prior from the generative memory and the intra-image prior from traditional encoder-decoder based framework respectively.

III. GENERATIVE MEMORY-GUIDED SEMANTIC REASONING MODEL

Given a corrupted image, the goal of image inpainting is to infer the content of the missing (corrupted) regions, which is required to be consistent with the known regions at both the pixel level and the semantic level. To this end, we propose the Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model (*GM-SRM*), which learns a generative memory from the corpus of training data to mine the general distribution patterns of visual semantics within images. Such learned generative memory is then leveraged to guide the process of image inpainting by performing inter-image semantic reasoning for the missing regions.

In this section, we will first introduce the overall framework of image inpainting by our model, then we will elaborate on how to construct the generative memory and perform semantic reasoning to infer the content of the missing regions. Next we present the conditional stochastic variation, a technique proposed to synthesize rich yet semantically reasonable details during image inpainting. Finally, we will show how to perform supervised learning to train our proposed *GM-SRM*.

A. Overall Framework for Image Inpainting

As illustrated in Figure 2, our *GM-SRM* mainly consists of three modules: the encoder \mathcal{E} , the generative memory \mathcal{M}



Fig. 2. Architecture of the proposed Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model(*GM-SRM*). It consists of three modules: the encoder \mathcal{E} , the generative memory \mathcal{M} and the decoder \mathcal{D} . The proposed *GM-SRM* learns two types of priors to perform image inpainting: 1) the intra-image priors learned from the known regions of current image by modeling the image-to-image mapping following the encoder-decoder framework, and 2) the inter-image priors on the visual distribution patterns that can be transferred across images, which are learned by the proposed generative memory \mathcal{M} from the whole training corpus. For each input corrupted image, the inter-image priors are retrieved from the pre-trained generative memory \mathcal{M} by searching for semantically matched features for the corrupted area using the encoded query code c from the encoder \mathcal{E} . The intra-image priors are generally used for pixel-level content inference while the inter-image priors favor the high-level semantic reasoning.

and the decoder \mathcal{D} . The whole model follows the classical encoder-decoder framework to perform image inpainting. The encoder \mathcal{E} is responsible for extracting useful visual features for the known regions of the input corrupted image and meanwhile generating a latent embedding which serves as a query code to search for semantically matched visual features from the generative memory \mathcal{M} . The generative memory \mathcal{M} is constructed to learn the general distribution patterns of visual semantics from training data and help to infer the content of the missing regions that is semantically consistent with the known regions in the input image. Thus the generative memory $\mathcal M$ summarizes the prior knowledge about the distribution of high-level visual semantics within images from a global view (covering the whole corpus of training data). Such distilled prior knowledge enables our model to infer more diverse yet semantically reasonable content for the missing regions than the typical way, which focuses on learning intra-image priors (from known regions to corrupted regions) by modeling imageto-image mapping between the input corrupted image and the corresponding intact image (groundtruth). The retrieved semantically matched features from the memory \mathcal{M} , together with the encoded features from the encoder \mathcal{E} , are fed into the decoder \mathcal{D} to synthesize the intact image.

Encoder. Given a corrupted image I with a mask M (with the same size as I) indicating the missing regions, the encoder \mathcal{E} extracts visual features for the known regions of I by:

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}(I, M),\tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$ denotes the obtained encoded features. As shown in Figure 2, the encoder \mathcal{E} is designed by repetitively stacking a basic residual block to iteratively refine visual features and meanwhile downsample the resolution of feature maps. Such residual block consists of stride-2 convolution layers along with ReLU layers. Besides, we utilize instance normalization (IN) [35] and channel attention (CA) mechanism [36] to optimize the feature learning process. Specifically, the *i*-th basic residual block in the encoder \mathcal{E} can be mathematically formulated as:

$$\mathbf{F}^{e} = \operatorname{ReLU}(\operatorname{IN}(\operatorname{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^{i-1}))),$$

$$\mathbf{F}^{i}_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathbf{F}^{e} + \operatorname{CA}(\operatorname{ReLU}(\operatorname{IN}(\operatorname{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{e})))),$$
(2)

where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^{i}$ is the output feature maps by the *i*-th basic residual block of \mathcal{E} , and \mathbf{F}^{e} is the intermediate features in the residual connection.

Besides learning visual features for the known regions of the input corrupted image, the encoder \mathcal{E} also generates a latent code based on the encoded features to perform feature query on the generative memory \mathcal{M} to search for semantically matched features for the missing regions:

$$\mathbf{c} = f_c(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}),\tag{3}$$

where the latent code c is a vector obtained by a non-linear mapping function f_c performed by a convolutional layer and a fully connected layer from the encoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Generative Memory. The generative memory \mathcal{M} is designed as a generative network to synthesize semantic feature maps from an latent vectorial code and thus learn the visual semantic distributions. It takes the latent code c as well as the encoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$ as input and generates the corresponding feature maps. As a result, the generative memory \mathcal{M} learns a mapping from the latent coding space to the synthesized visual features. Since the latent code is generated from the encoded features for the known regions, the generative memory \mathcal{M} is able to synthesize the matched feature maps that is semantically



Fig. 3. The structure of the proposed generative memory in *GM-SRM*. c^i denotes the latent code, F_e and F_{i-1} represent the features from the encoder and last memory block respectively, and \bigcirc is the feature concatenation operation.

consistent with the known regions, under the supervised learning for the whole *GM-SRM* model. Formally, the synthesized feature maps $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ corresponding to the latent code c by the generative memory \mathcal{M} is obtained by:

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}). \tag{4}$$

We will elaborate on the model structure of the generative memory \mathcal{M} and describe how to perform progressive semantic reasoning based upon \mathcal{M} in Section III-B.

Decoder. The synthesized features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be considered as the inferred semantic features as inter-image priors by the memory \mathcal{M} for the missing regions of the input corrupted image. Both $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the encoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$ for the known regions as the intra-image priors are fed into the decoder \mathcal{D} to synthesize the output intact image \hat{I} :

$$\hat{I} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}).$$
(5)

The decoder \mathcal{D} is built in the similar way as the encoder: repetitively stacking a basic residual block to progressively synthesize the final intact image. One major difference from the encoder is that the decoder utilizes the bi-linear interpolation f_{interp} in each basic block to upsample feature maps gradually. Specifically, the *i*-th basic block of the decoder \mathcal{D} is formulated as:

$$\mathbf{F}^{d} = \operatorname{ReLU}(\operatorname{IN}(\operatorname{Conv}(f_{\operatorname{interp}}(\operatorname{Concat}[\mathbf{F}^{i}_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbf{F}^{i}_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathbf{F}^{i-1}_{\mathcal{D}}])))),$$

$$\mathbf{F}^{i}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathbf{F}^{d} + \operatorname{CA}(\operatorname{ReLU}(\operatorname{IN}(\operatorname{Conv}((\mathbf{F}^{d})))),$$

(6)

where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i}$ is the output feature maps of the *i*-th basic block in the decoder \mathcal{D} , and \mathbf{F}^{d} is the intermediate features in the residual connection.

The whole inference process of our *GM-SRM* is summarized in Algorithm 1.

B. Semantic Reasoning by Generative Memory

The generative Memory \mathcal{M} is proposed to learn the general distribution patterns of visual semantics within images,

Algorithm 1 Inference of GM-SRM

- Input: $I_{in}, M_{in}, \mathcal{M}, E_i, D_i, c.$
- I_{in} : Input corrupted image;
- M_{in} : Mask of corrupted region;
- \mathcal{M} : Pre-trained generative memory;
- E_i : i-th layer of encoder E;
- D_i : i-th layer of decoder D;
- c : Latent codes for memory reasoning.
- **Output:** \hat{I}_{out} , restored image from input I_{in} .
- 1: **#** Initializing input;
- 2: $F_{\mathcal{E}}^1 = \text{Concat}[I_{in}, M_{in}]$
- 3: # Encoding, n_e is the layer number of encoder;
- 4: for $i = 1 \to n_e 1$ do
- 5: $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon}^{i+1} = \mathbf{E}_i(\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon}^i)$
- 6: # Estimate the mean μ and the standard variation σ^2 ;
- 7: $\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 = \text{Mean}(\text{Split}(\text{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^i)))$
- 8: # Initializing query codes;
- 9: $c_1 = \text{Linear}(\text{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^{n_e}))$
- 10: $F_{D}^{1} = F_{D}^{n_{e}}$
- 11: # Decoding, n_d is the layer number of decoder;
- 12: for $j = 1 \rightarrow n_d 1$ do
- 13: $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^{j+1} = \mathbf{D}_j(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^j)$
- 14: # Update the latent codes;
- 15: $c_{j+1} = \text{Linear}(\text{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^{n_d-j})) + c_j$
- 16: Sampling noise_{j+1} from distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{n_d-j}, \sigma_{n_d-j}^2)$
- 17: # Semantic reasoning in generative memory;
- 18: $F_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}(F_{\mathcal{E}}^{n_d-j}, c_{j+1}, \text{noise}_{j+1})$
- 19: # Inference by known content and memory query;
- 20: $F_{\mathcal{D}}^{j+1} = \text{Concat}[F_{\mathcal{D}}^{j+1}, F_{\mathcal{M}}]$
- 21: # Synthesize final restored output image.
- 22: $\hat{I}_{out} = OutConv(F_{D}^{n_d})$

such as high-level semantics that can be transferred across different images sharing similar semantic distributions. The learned prior knowledge about the semantic distributions by the generative memory \mathcal{M} is then leveraged by our *GM-SRM* to perform inter-image semantic reasoning for the missing regions given the information of known regions.

Construction of Generative Memory. The generative memory can be designed as an image-generative network in many practical structures. As shown in Figure 3, we opt for the generative structure of revised StyleGAN [37] due to its excellent performance of image synthesis by learning the mapping between the latent space and synthesized images via the improved AdaIN operation with the proposed demodulation [37]. Similar strategy of employing StyleGAN to pre-learn a semantic dictionary is also adopted by GLEAN [26] for image super-resolution. To learn the general semantic distribution patterns, we pre-train the generative memory on the whole training data in the similar training way as StyleGAN, except that we replace the mapping network in the StyleGAN with the mapping function in Equation 3 to learn the underlying correspondence between the latent code (representing the semantics of the existing regions) and the synthesized feature maps for the missing regions. After sufficient training on the whole corpus of training data, the generative memory \mathcal{M} is expected to learn a well mapping between the latent space and visual semantic features, thereby summarizing the prior knowledge about the general distribution patterns of visual semantics from a global view. Once the memory \mathcal{M} is pretrained, the parameters of the memory \mathcal{M} are frozen and \mathcal{M} is used to perform semantic reasoning during the training of the whole *GM-SRM*, i.e., to infer the semantic features for the missing regions of the input image based on the latent code of the known regions.

Progressive Semantic Reasoning. We leverage the learned generative memory \mathcal{M} to perform progressive semantic reasoning and thereby assisting the decoder \mathcal{D} to conduct image inpainting. As shown in Equation 6, the decoder \mathcal{D} employs multiple basic blocks to synthesize the intact image in a coarse-to-fine manner by progressively expanding the resolution of the generated feature maps. Accordingly, the generative memory infers the semantics for the missing regions for each resolution of feature maps to keep pace with the synthesizing process of the decoder \mathcal{D} . As a result, the memory \mathcal{M} and the decoder \mathcal{D} are able to perform image inpainting collaboratively in an iterative way: the inferred semantic features by \mathcal{M} are fed into \mathcal{D} to provide high-level semantic cues for decoding the same resolution of feature maps, while the decoded feature maps are in turn provided for \mathcal{M} to update the latent code for the next scale of semantic inferring in larger resolution:

$$\mathbf{c}^{i} = f_{c}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i-1}) + \mathbf{c}^{i-1},\tag{7}$$

where f_c corresponds to the same mapping function as in Equation 3. \mathbf{c}^i denotes the latent code to retrieve the semantic features $\mathbf{F}^i_{\mathcal{M}}$ from \mathcal{M} , which is prepared for decoding $\mathbf{F}^i_{\mathcal{D}}$ by the *i*-th block of \mathcal{D} . As a result, the newly inferred features for the missing regions can be incorporated into the updated latent code to predict the semantic features for the next basic block of \mathcal{D} . The image inpainting is performed in such a progressively inferring mechanism to predict the content of missing regions by the generative memory \mathcal{M} and the decoder \mathcal{D} collaboratively.

Compared to the typical methods for image inpainting that focus on learning intra-image priors by modeling the imageto-image mapping, the key benefit of our *GM-SRM* is that the generative memory learns the semantic distributions as prior knowledge in a global view from the whole corpus of training data, which can be generalized across different images sharing similar semantic distributions. As a result, such learned prior knowledge about the general semantic distributions enables our model to perform high-level inter-image semantic reasoning to infer more diverse yet semantically reasonable content for the missing regions. Our method is particularly effective in scenarios with large corrupted area.

C. Conditional Stochastic Variation

To simulate the stochastic appearance variations in synthesized images that do not violate the correct semantics and enrich the texture details, random noise is introduced into synthesizing process in StyleGAN in multiple generative layers. Inspired by such Stochastic Variation scheme in StyleGAN, we also incorporate noise as input during image synthesis in the generative memory \mathcal{M} . Unlike StyleGAN that synthesizes images from random latent code without conditioning on any



Fig. 4. Unlike typical StyleGAN that simply samples noise randomly from a standard normal distribution (a), our proposed Conditional Stochastic Variation mechanism samples noise conditioned on the encoded features $F_{\mathcal{D}}^{i}$ in the current layer and the decoded features $F_{\mathcal{D}}^{i-1}$ (in the previous layer).

input information, the generated features by \mathcal{M} of our GM-SRM model are required to be semantically consistent with the known regions. Thus we propose the Conditional Stochastic Variation mechanism, which introduces noise conditioned on the semantics of the known regions into the synthesis process of the generative memory \mathcal{M} to enrich the appearance details of synthesized images while keeping the semantics correct.

Noise is introduced into each synthesizing layer of \mathcal{M} to ensure the texture diversity of generated features in each resolution. As shown in Figure 4, the noise in each layer is generated conditioned on the encoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$ by \mathcal{E} in the current layer and the decoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}$ by \mathcal{D} in the previous layer. Specifically, a normal distribution is predicted from $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}$ by a convolution layer and a fully connected layer (FC), then the conditional noise is sampled from such predicted normal distribution. For instance, the noise for the *i*-th layer of \mathcal{M} is generated by the proposed Conditional Stochastic Variation Mechanism by:

$$\mu_i, \sigma_i = \text{FC}(\text{Conv}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^i, \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i-1}))),$$

$$\text{noise}_i = \text{Sample}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)),$$
(8)

where μ_i and σ_i are the mean and standard variation for the predicted normal distribution for the *i*-th synthesis layer conditioned on the encoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{E}}^i$ and the decoded features $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^i$. To encourage the generated noise distribution to be close to the standard normal distribution to ease the noise-sampling process, we leverage KL divergence to guide the parameter learning in Equation 8, which is similar to VAE [23]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{KL}} = \sum w_i \cdot \mathrm{KL}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2) \mid \mathcal{N}(0, 1)), \qquad (9)$$

where w for different layers are the weights to balance between different synthesis layers, and KL denotes the KL divergence between two distribution. Figure 5 shows two examples which illustrate the comparison between typical Stochastic Variation mechanism performed by random noise and our proposed Conditional Stochastic Variation Mechanism. These examples reveal that the conditional noise generated by our Conditional Stochastic Variation leads to more consistent semantic content in the missing regions, while keeping rich texture details. In



Fig. 5. Comparison of inpainting results between our *GM-SRM* using randomly noise and our Conditional Stochastic Variation mechanism. by our GM-SRM. (a) Corrupted input images. (b) Restored images using the Conditional noise by the proposed Conditional Stochastic Variation mechanism. (c) Restored images using random noise.

contrast, the random noise tends to result in blurred texture due to completely random nature of introduced noise.

D. Supervised Parameter Learning

Our proposed *GM-SRM* is trained in two steps: the generative memory \mathcal{M} is first pre-trained to learn the prior knowledge about the general distribution patterns of visual semantics. Then the whole *GM-SRM* is trained for image inpainting while keeping the parameters of \mathcal{M} frozen. Since the generative memory \mathcal{M} is trained in the similar way as the training process of StyleGAN, we explicate how to perform supervised learning to train the whole *GM-SRM*.

We employ four types of loss functions to train our *GM*-*SRM*. Apart from the loss function in Equation 9, the other three loss functions are presented below:

 Pixel-wise L1 Reconstruction Loss, which focuses on pixel-level measurement of known regions and corrupted regions between groundtruth and synthesized images respectively:

$$\mathcal{L}_{L1} = \| \hat{I} - I_{GT} \|_{1},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec} = \mathcal{L}_{known-L1} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{corrupted-L1},$$
(10)

where \hat{I} is the synthesized image by our *GM-SRM*, and I_{GT} are the corresponding ground-truth image. γ is a hyperparameter to balance between losses, which is tuned to be 10 on a held-out validation set.

• **Perceptual Loss** [38], which aims to minimize the semantic difference between restored image and the ground-truth image in deep feature space:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{perc}}(\hat{I}, I_{GT}) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{1}{C_l H_l W_l} \| f_{\text{vgg}}^l(\hat{I}) - f_{\text{vgg}}^l(I_{GT}) \|_1, \quad (11)$$

where $f_{\text{vgg}}^{l}(\hat{I})$ and $f_{\text{vgg}}^{l}(I_{GT})$ are the extracted feature maps, normalized by feature dimensions $C_{l} \times H_{l} \times W_{l}$), for the generated image \hat{I} and the ground-truth image I_{GT} respectively from the *l*-th convolution layer of the pretrained VGG-19 network [39].

• Conditional Adversarial Loss, which encourages the synthesized image \hat{I} to be as realistic as the ground-truth image I_{GT} . We employ spectral normalization [40] in discriminator to stabilize the training process:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{adv}} = -\mathbb{E}_{B \sim \mathbb{P}_{\text{GM-SRM}}}[D^{sn}(G(I))], \qquad (12)$$

where D^{sn} is the spectral normalized discriminator. It is trained by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{D^{sn}} = \mathbb{E}_{B_{GT} \sim \mathbb{P}_{data}}[1 - D^{sn}(G(I))] \\ + \mathbb{E}_{B \sim \mathbb{P}_{GM,SRM}}[D^{sn}(G(I))].$$
(13)

Overall, the whole GM-SRM is trained by:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{perc}} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{\text{adv}} + \lambda_4 \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}}, \qquad (14)$$

where λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_3 and λ_4 are hyper-parameters to balance between different losses. In our experiments, we empirically set $\lambda_1=1$, $\lambda_2=0.1$, $\lambda_3=0.01$ and $\lambda_4=0.01$.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct experiments to quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate the proposed *GM-SRM*. In Section IV-A, we introduce benchmark datasets used in the experiments, evaluation metrics and implementation details. In Section IV-B, we conduct experiments to compare our model with state-of-the-art methods for image inpainting. Finally, we perform ablation study to investigate the effectiveness of each component in our *GM-SRM* in Section IV-C.

A. Experimental Setting

Evaluation Metrics. We employ four generally used criteria as quantitative measurements to quantify the quality of the restored images in our experiments: 1) the peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR), 2) the structural similarity index (SSIM) [44], 3) the normalized cross correlation (NCC) [45], and 4) the local mean square error (LMSE) [46]. Additionally, we perform qualitative evaluation by visually comparing the restored results of randomly selected test samples by various models for different degree corruption in experiments. As a complement to the standard evaluation metrics, we further conduct user study to compare our results to the state-of-the-art results by human evaluation.

Datasets. We perform experiments on three benchmark datasets for image inpainting:

- **Paris Street View** [41], which is collected from street views of Paris, and we leverage its original splits, 14,900 images for training and 100 images for testing.
- CelebA-HQ256 [42], which contains 30,000 images of human face. We randomly select 3000 images as validation and testing dataset and leverage remained 27,000 images as training dataset.

TABLE I

Performance of different models for irregular image inpainting on the Paris StreetView [41], CelebA-HQ256 [42], and Places [43] datasets. Metrics with \uparrow , higher value denotes better performance, whereas \downarrow denotes lower is better. The methods in type A learn only the intra-image priors while the methods in type A + B learn both the intra-image priors and inter-image priors. The best results of each metric are highlighted in bold.

	Method Type		Paris StreetView				CelebA-HQ256				Places2			
		Type	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	26.85	24.66	22.67	20.52	28.29	26.11	23.90	21.47	25.05	22.99	21.11	19.04
$PSNR \uparrow$	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	26.29	23.99	21.86	19.79	27.81	25.52	23.19	20.64	25.15	23.00	20.94	18.68
	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	27.62	25.39	23.19	20.86	28.53	26.14	23.53	20.38	25.75	23.64	21.66	19.46
	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	25.04	23.10	21.15	19.00	30.22	27.63	24.95	21.51	27.04	24.68	22.35	19.77
	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	27.54	25.25	23.09	20.84	28.86	26.55	24.22	21.68	25.69	23.46	21.41	19.21
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	27.23	24.78	22.30	19.84	25.50	24.10	22.31	20.04	24.84	23.38	21.38	18.27
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	27.26	24.71	22.76	20.58	27.96	25.89	24.73	21.26	25.54	23.51	21.60	19.41
	GM-SRM (ours)	$\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B}$	29.04	26.79	24.51	22.20	30.23	27.91	25.51	22.70	27.09	24.93	22.91	20.60
SSIM \uparrow	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.861	0.795	0.711	0.622	0.896	0.847	0.783	0.711	0.844	0.777	0.693	0.611
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.865	0.801	0.714	0.625	0.894	0.842	0.772	0.693	0.859	0.796	0.714	0.630
	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.879	0.821	0.740	0.651	0.905	0.856	0.784	0.689	0.862	0.799	0.717	0.633
	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.881	0.823	0.744	0.642	0.928	0.886	0.822	0.724	0.882	0.823	0.744	0.655
	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.879	0.816	0.732	0.637	0.907	0.860	0.796	0.718	0.861	0.794	0.708	0.619
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.876	0.811	0.718	0.616	0.884	0.810	0.759	0.666	0.833	0.809	0.738	0.636
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.871	0.813	0.739	0.651	0.903	0.859	0.802	0.716	0.869	0.811	0.738	0.666
	GM-SRM (ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.902	0.852	0.780	0.696	0.925	0.886	0.832	0.760	0.883	0.827	0.756	0.677
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.957	0.934	0.895	0.835	0.986	0.978	0.964	0.938	0.957	0.934	0.898	0.838
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.951	0.924	0.878	0.811	0.985	0.975	0.958	0.926	0.956	0.933	0.894	0.826
<u>←</u>	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.963	0.943	0.906	0.848	0.987	0.978	0.960	0.920	0.962	0.942	0.908	0.850
2	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.971	0.954	0.919	0.859	0.991	0.985	0.972	0.940	0.972	0.954	0.921	0.862
z	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.962	0.941	0.904	0.845	0.987	0.980	0.966	0.940	0.962	0.941	0.906	0.848
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.961	0.937	0.889	0.814	0.976	0.967	0.950	0.917	0.956	0.939	0.906	0.813
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.964	0.947	0.916	0.854	0.988	0.981	0.969	0.937	0.968	0.952	0.925	0.876
	GM-SRM (ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.972	0.958	0.929	0.879	0.991	0.985	0.974	0.952	0.972	0.956	0.929	0.880
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.016	0.025	0.037	0.051	0.007	0.011	0.017	0.026	0.018	0.027	0.038	0.053
$ASE \downarrow$	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.019	0.030	0.046	0.064	0.008	0.013	0.020	0.031	0.019	0.029	0.043	0.062
	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.013	0.020	0.044	0.064	0.006	0.010	0.017	0.031	0.015	0.023	0.034	0.048
	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.010	0.016	0.027	0.040	0.004	0.007	0.013	0.024	0.011	0.019	0.030	0.046
Ľ	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.014	0.022	0.033	0.047	0.006	0.010	0.016	0.025	0.016	0.025	0.037	0.053
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.014	0.023	0.038	0.055	0.011	0.015	0.021	0.032	0.018	0.025	0.037	0.058
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.011	0.020	0.029	0.049	0.006	0.009	0.013	0.024	0.014	0.019	0.040	0.046
	GM-SRM (ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.009	0.015	0.023	0.034	0.004	0.006	0.011	0.018	0.011	0.017	0.025	0.037

• **Places2** [43], which is composed of over 2,000,000 images from 365 scenes. We select 2 full categories obtaining 80,000 images and randomly picks 1,500 images from each category as test set respectively. The remaining 74,000 images are employed as training set.

By following PIC [21], we randomly generate irregular and regular masks for training. As for test, we leverage PConv's [7] irregular mask and center mask in multiple degradation ratios.

Implementation Details. We implement our *GM-SRM* in distribution mode with 4 RTX 3090 GPUs under Pytorch framework. Adam [47] is employed for gradient descent optimization with batch size set to be 8. The initial learning rate is set to be 2×10^{-4} and the training process takes maximally 100 epochs. In our experiments, we resize all images to make the shorter side to be 320, and then crop into 256×256 . Random flipping, random cropping and resizing are used for data augmentation.

B. Comparison with State-of-the-art Methods

We first conduct experiments to compare *GM-SRM* with state-of-the-art methods for image inpainting on three datasets, including Paris StreetView [41], CelebA-HQ256 [42], and

Places2 [43]. In particular, we divide masks by ranging percentage of corrupted size.

Baselines. Concretely, we compare our GM-SRM with 1) PConv [7], employing partial convolution to cope with irregular corruption; 2) DeepFill V2 [8], which proposes Gated convolution to generalize PConv; 3) EdgeConnect [10], which first predicts edge map and then leverages predicted edge maps to facilitate restoration; 4) LISK [12], which incorporates structural knowledge to reconstruct corrupted image and structure maps simultaneously; 5) LBAM [19], introducing a learnable reverse attention mechanism to fill missing regions; 6) MEDFE [33], which proposes a mutual encoder-decoder to reconstruct structure and textures separately, and then fuses them by feature equalization; 7) Lahiri et al. [24], which learns the inter-image priors by pre-training a generative network as the decoder. It should be noted that all these methods except Lahiri et al. only learn the intra-image priors to perform image inpainting.

Quantitative Evaluation. Table I and Table II present the experimental results of different methods for image inpainting on three benchmarks in terms of PSNR, SSIM, NCC, and LMSE. To quantify model performance, we leverage two types of corrupted masks for testing, regularly center mask



Fig. 6. Visualization of restored images by five state-of-the-art models for image inpainting and our *GM-SRM* on three randomly selected samples from Paris Street View [41] test set. Our model is able to restore higher-quality image than other methods. Best viewed in zoom-in mode.



Fig. 7. Quantitative comparison on Paris Street View [41] for varying degradation ratios in terms of PSNR and SSIM. Competing methods includes PConv [7], DeepFillv2 [8], LISK [12], MEDFE [33], Lahiri *et al.* [24], and our *GM-SRM*. Though higher degradation ratio leads to faster decreasing of quantitative metrics, the *GM-SRM* performs more stably than other state-of-the-art methods.

and irregular mask. In addition, we divide them into various corrupted ratios, *i.e.*, (20%, 30%], (30%, 40%], (40%, 50%], and (50%, 60%] for irregular mask, and 25% and 50% for center mask. For fair comparison, we obtain restoration results from officially released source codes and pre-trained models. According to their source code and paper, we re-implement models that don't release official pre-trained models. We leverage the same mask for each test image to evaluate results of different methods.

As illustrated in Table I, we compare quantitative results of our *GM-SRM* with state-of-the-art methods on three benchmarks for irregular inpainting. On Paris Street View dataset [41], our *GM-SRM* outperforms other competing methods by a large margin on four metrics. As illustrated in Figure 7, our *GM-SRM* achieves significant improvements (higher than 1.3 dB PSNR) for each corruption ratio. For CelebA-HQ dataset, although face structure is relatively fixed, our *GM-SRM* still outperforms other state-of-the-art methods more than 1 dB of PSNR gain for the large hole-to-image area ratio (50%,60%]. The performance of our *GM-SRM* on Places2 [43] dataset is also better than other methods, especially in the cases with large corruption ratio. In sum, our *GM-SRM* achieves the best performance in terms of four quantitative metrics for irregular corruption, and outperforms other state-of-the-

TABLE II

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Performance of different models for regular image inpainting on the Paris StreetView [41], CelebA-HQ256 [42], and Places2 [43] datasets. Metrics with <math display="inline">\uparrow$, higher value denotes better performance, whereas \downarrow denotes lower is better. The methods in type \mathcal{A} learn only the intra-image priors while the methods in type $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ learn both the intra-image priors and inter-image priors. The best results of each metric are highlighted in bold. \end{array}

Method		Type	Paris StreetView		CelebA-HQ256		Places2	
	memou	Type	25%	50%	25%	50%	25%	50%
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	23.97	20.02	20.54	14.56	21.69	18.09
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	23.32	18.98	25.45	19.86	21.27	17.54
~	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	24.91	20.32	23.68	18.83	22.39	18.48
PSNR	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	22.28	18.32	24.28	18.02	22.52	18.54
	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	24.18	20.14	25.91	20.73	21.79	18.38
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	23.43	19.09	25.54	20.26	21.18	17.57
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	24.79	19.92	25.51	20.50	22.35	18.36
	GM-SRM(ours)	$\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B}$	25.86	21.41	26.97	21.75	23.33	19.51
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.828	0.638	0.797	0.596	0.816	0.633
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.832	0.633	0.876	0.694	0.823	0.638
÷	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.846	0.659	0.860	0.672	0.827	0.647
Ę.	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.828	0.639	0.873	0.675	0.842	0.662
ŝ	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.832	0.637	0.887	0.719	0.820	0.634
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.827	0.615	0.880	0.703	0.813	0.622
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.835	0.649	0.882	0.701	0.830	0.669
	GM-SRM(ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.862	0.695	0.901	0.757	0.845	0.683
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.924	0.817	0.894	0.691	0.909	0.800
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.913	0.781	0.974	0.911	0.899	0.781
~	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.937	0.829	0.962	0.887	0.920	0.815
8	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.939	0.833	0.968	0.871	0.930	0.833
z	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.928	0.820	0.976	0.926	0.917	0.820
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.919	0.782	0.974	0.918	0.902	0.781
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.929	0.830	0.969	0.926	0.919	0.830
	GM-SRM(ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.946	0.860	0.981	0.940	0.932	0.840
	PConv [7]	\mathcal{A}	0.024	0.051	0.023	0.044	0.027	0.054
	DeepFill V2 [8]	\mathcal{A}	0.029	0.069	0.012	0.034	0.034	0.068
ш	EdgeConnect [10]	\mathcal{A}	0.019	0.046	0.017	0.038	0.024	0.051
1SI	LISK [12]	\mathcal{A}	0.017	0.044	0.015	0.032	0.020	0.047
E	LBAM [19]	\mathcal{A}	0.022	0.049	0.011	0.028	0.028	0.055
	MEDFE [33]	\mathcal{A}	0.022	0.060	0.012	0.033	0.030	0.063
	Lahiri et al. [24]	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.026	0.047	0.020	0.034	0.030	0.050
	GM-SRM(ours)	$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$	0.015	0.035	0.008	0.022	0.017	0.038

art methods in various corruption ratio. Comparing with the methods that only learn intra-image priors, namely all methods in comparison except Lahiri *et al.*, our method also learns the inter-image priors by the proposed generative memory, which



Fig. 8. Visualization of restored images by five state-of-the-art models for image inpainting and our *GM-SRM* on three randomly selected samples from CelebA-HQ256 [42] test set. Our model is able to restore higher-quality image than other methods. Best viewed in zoom-in mode.



Fig. 9. Visualization of restored images by five state-of-the-art models for image inpainting and our *GM-SRM* on four randomly selected samples from Places2 [43] test set. Our model is able to restore higher-quality image than other methods. Best viewed in zoom-in mode.

enables our model to perform high-level semantic reasoning between images with similar semantic distributions. It is worth noting that our *GM-SRM* significantly outperforms Lahiri *et al.* on all datasets, which learns the inter-image priors by simply pre-training the decoder. It reveals the effectiveness of the proposed generative memory in *GM-SRM* for learning interimage priors.

Table II lists experimental results for challenging center masked images. Unlike former experiments that only compares 25% corrupted ratios, we provide results for both 25% and 50% corrupted ratios from continuous center masked corruption to evaluate the performance of methods on image inpainting with small and large corrupted area, respectively.

As shown in Table II, *GM-SRM* outperforms other state-of-theart methods in terms of all four metrics on three benchmark datasets. This demonstrates *GM-SRM* can synthesize more reliable content than other methods, especially in cases with large corrupted area.

Qualitative Evaluation. We compare the restored results by our *GM-SRM* and other state-of-the-art image inpainting methods on Paris Street View [41], CelebA-HQ [42], and Places2 [43] in Figure 6, 8 and 9. PConv [7] is specifically proposed to handle irregular corruption, and thus it restores plausible results in Figure 6(b) and Figure 8(b). However, it even cannot fill in reasonable structure when restoring large continuous corruption. DeepFillv2 [8] normalizes feature maps

USER STUDY ON 100 RESTORED RESULTS OF PLACES2 [43], AND CELEBA-HQ256 [42]. 50 HUMAN SUBJECTS ARE PERFORMED FOR COMPARISON BETWEEN OUR *GM-SRM* AND STATE-OF-THE-ART METHODS.

Method	Share of the	ne vote	Winning samples			
Method	CelebA-HQ	Places2	CelebA-HQ	Places2		
DeepFill V2 [8]	3.96%	8.92%	1	3		
LISK [12]	15.84%	16.60%	4	6		
Lahiri et al. [24]	0.28%	4.68%	0	2		
MEDFE [33]	19.00%	11.16%	6	7		
GM-SRM	60.92%	58.64%	39	32		

by the soft mask mechanism, and this relieves limitation of PConv. Although convincing structure are synthesized in corrupted area, undesired artifacts can still be observed in Figure 8(c). LISK [12] integrates structural information to infer corrupted regions, which may leads to confusing content for the error prediction of image structure(see Figure 8)(d). MEDFE [33] restores structure and texture at the same time. Thus, it predicts stable structure than other competing methods from Figure 8. And yet MEDFE produces unwanted blurriness and color discrepancy(see Figure 9(e)). Conversely, our *GM*-*SRM* synthesizes higher quality content and more reliable semantic structures. From Figure 6, 8 and 9, *GM*-*SRM* avoids undesired blurriness, artifacts and color discrepancy to making restored images more realistic.

Compared with Lahiri *et al.* which also learns the interimage priors for image inpainting, our *GM-SRM* is able to restore content for the corrupted area that is more realistic in pixel level and more reasonable in semantic level. These qualitative comparisons illustrates the advantages of our model over Lahiri *et al.* in learning the inter-image priors.

User Study. Quantitative metrics have their bias for quality evaluation of restored images. To standardize evaluation process, we further perform user study with another four state-of-the-art methods for image inpainting, including Deep-Fillv2 [8], LISK [12], Lahiri et al. [24] and MEDFE [33]. We randomly select 50 test images of CelebA-HQ [42] and Places2 [43] respectively, and present restoration results of four methods to 50 human subjects for manual ranking of image quality. Table III lists voting results of this user study. For CelebA-HQ dataset, our *GM-SRM* reaches 60.92% votes among total $50 \times 50 = 2500$ rankings, which is much higher than other competing methods. In addition, we count winning samples of each method, and our GM-SRM wins on 39 test samples and others altogether 11 samples. As for Places2 dataset, our GM-SRM reaches 58.64% votes among 2500 rankings, which is much higher than other competing methods as well. And our GM-SRM wins on 32 test samples and others altogether 18 samples.

C. Investigation on GM-SRM by Ablation Study

We conduct ablation study to investigate the effect of different structural components in *GM-SRM*. To such end, we perform experiments on four variants of our *GM-SRM*.

 TABLE IV

 Ablation experiments of 50% corruption ratio on

 CelebA-HQ [42] in terms of PSNR, SSIM, NCC, and LMSE to

 Investigate effect of each component in our *GM-SRM* and each

 LOSS FUNCTION.

Method	PSNR	SSIM	NCC	LMSE
Base model	18.39	0.694	0.874	0.032
GM-BM	20.43	0.729	0.921	0.027
GM-CSV	21.06	0.734	0.930	0.023
GM-SRM	21.75	0.757	0.940	0.022

- **Base model**, which only employs an encoder-decoder model as the base network to restore corrupted images. Thus, no generative memory or stochastic variation strategies are leveraged.
- **GM-BM**, which further leverages decoder to integrate features from both generative memory and encoder, and this is equivalent to plug Generative Memory in Base Model as semantic query unit for image generation.
- **GM-CSV**, which leverages Generative Memory with Conditional Stochastic Variation strategy to obtain more realist details in restored area.
- *GM-SRM*, which further leverages progressive reasoning strategy to stabilize generated structure and improve image quality. The resulting model is our intact *GM-SRM*.

Table IV illustrates the results of four variants of *GM-SRM* on CelebA-HQ dataset, in terms of PSNR, and SSIM.

Effect of generative memory. As illustrated in Table IV, the large gap between **Base model** and **GM-BM** demonstrate that our proposed generative memory improves image inpainting performance significantly compared to traditional encoder-decoder architecture. Combining pixel-wise restoration with generative semantic space, generative memory facilitates to restore reasonable results while coping with large region corruption.

Effect of conditional stochastic variation. The conditional stochastic variation improves the texture quality of restored images due to learning conditional distribution from known information as constraint. More intuitive results are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 10.

Effect of progressive reasoning strategy. Comparison between GM-CSV and GM-SRM demonstrates that progressive reasoning strategy indeed elevates restoration quality. In Figure 10, the GM-SRM makes restored structure and more stable and reasonable. For instance, in Figure 10(e), the GM-CSV generates a weird ear which seems too long, but the GM-SRM corrects it. Considering information increment from feature inference in different scales, progressive strategy makes restoration process reliable according to more known content.

Qualitative ablation evaluation. As illustrated in Figure 10, restoration results of four variants of *GM-SRM* are visualized. It demonstrates that quality of restored content is increasingly better as the augment of *GM-SRM* with different functional components.



(a) Input (b) Base Model (c) GM-BM (d) GM-CSV (e) GM-SRM (f) Groundtruth Fig. 10. Visualization of restored images from 50% center corruption by four variants of the *GM-SRM* for image inpainting on two samples which are

V. CONCLUSION

randomly selected from CelebA-HQ test set. Best viewed in zoom-in mode.

In this work, we have presented the Generative Memory-Guided Semantic Reasoning Model (*GM-SRM*) for image inpainting, which learns both the intra-image priors and inter-image priors to infer the content of the corrupted regions. The intra-image priors are learned by modeling the image-to-image mapping by the encoder-decoder framework, which is similar to most existing work. To distill the inter-image priors, we design a generative memory to mine the general distribution patterns of visual semantics that can be generalized across images sharing similar semantics. Compared to the intra-image priors that are mainly used for pixel-level content inference, the learned inter-image priors favors high-level semantic reasoning. As a result, our model is able to synthesize diverse yet semantically reasonable content for the corrupted regions, especially in the scenarios with large corrupted area.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Wan, B. Zhang, D. Chen, P. Zhang, D. Chen, J. Liao, and F. Wen, "Bringing old photos back to life," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 2747–2757.
- [2] D. Bau, H. Strobelt, W. Peebles, J. Wulff, B. Zhou, J.-Y. Zhu, and A. Torralba, "Semantic photo manipulation with a generative image prior," ACM Transactions on Graphics, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1–11, 2019.
- [3] C. Ballester, M. Bertalmio, V. Caselles, G. Sapiro, and J. Verdera, "Filling-in by joint interpolation of vector fields and gray levels," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1200–1211, 2001.
- [4] C. Barnes, E. Shechtman, A. Finkelstein, and D. B. Goldman, "Patchmatch: A randomized correspondence algorithm for structural image editing," ACM Trans. Graph., vol. 28, no. 3, p. 24, 2009.
- [5] S. J. J. Ren, L. Xu, Q. Yan, and W. Sun, "Shepard convolutional neural networks," *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015.
- [6] D. Pathak, P. Krahenbuhl, J. Donahue, T. Darrell, and A. A. Efros, "Context encoders: Feature learning by inpainting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 2536–2544.
- [7] G. Liu, F. A. Reda, K. J. Shih, T.-C. Wang, A. Tao, and B. Catanzaro, "Image inpainting for irregular holes using partial convolutions," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 85–100.
- [8] J. Yu, Z. Lin, J. Yang, X. Shen, X. Lu, and T. S. Huang, "Freeform image inpainting with gated convolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 4471–4480.

- [9] J. Li, N. Wang, L. Zhang, B. Du, and D. Tao, "Recurrent feature reasoning for image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2020.
- [10] K. Nazeri, E. Ng, T. Joseph, F. Qureshi, and M. Ebrahimi, "Edgeconnect: Structure guided image inpainting using edge prediction," in *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, Oct 2019.
- [11] Y. Ren, X. Yu, R. Zhang, T. H. Li, S. Liu, and G. Li, "Structureflow: Image inpainting via structure-aware appearance flow," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [12] Y. S. Jie Yang, Zhiquan Qi, "Learning to incorporate structure knowledge for image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 7, 2020, pp. 12605–12612.
- [13] J. Li, F. He, L. Zhang, B. Du, and D. Tao, "Progressive reconstruction of visual structure for image inpainting," in *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, October 2019.
- [14] Y. Song, C. Yang, Z. Lin, X. Liu, Q. Huang, H. Li, and C.-C. J. Kuo, "Contextual-based image inpainting: Infer, match, and translate," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018, pp. 3–19.
- [15] Z. Yan, X. Li, M. Li, W. Zuo, and S. Shan, "Shift-net: Image inpainting via deep feature rearrangement," in *The European Conference on Computer Vision*, September 2018.
- [16] J. Yu, Z. Lin, J. Yang, X. Shen, X. Lu, and T. S. Huang, "Generative image inpainting with contextual attention," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 5505–5514.
- [17] N. Wang, J. Li, L. Zhang, and B. Du, "Musical: Multi-scale image contextual attention learning for inpainting," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019, pp. 3748–3754.
- [18] H. Liu, B. Jiang, Y. Xiao, and C. Yang, "Coherent semantic attention for image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 4170–4179.
- [19] C. Xie, S. Liu, C. Li, M.-M. Cheng, W. Zuo, X. Liu, S. Wen, and E. Ding, "Image inpainting with learnable bidirectional attention maps," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 8858–8867.
- [20] N. Wang, S. Ma, J. Li, Y. Zhang, and L. Zhang, "Multistage attention network for image inpainting," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 106, p. 107448, 2020.
- [21] C. Zheng, T.-J. Cham, and J. Cai, "Pluralistic image completion," in Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp. 1438–1447.
- [22] L. Zhao, Q. Mo, S. Lin, Z. Wang, Z. Zuo, H. Chen, W. Xing, and D. Lu, "Uctgan: Diverse image inpainting based on unsupervised cross-space translation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 5741–5750.
- [23] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114, 2013.
- [24] A. Lahiri, A. K. Jain, S. Agrawal, P. Mitra, and P. K. Biswas, "Prior guided gan based semantic inpainting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF*

- [25] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- [26] K. C. Chan, X. Wang, X. Xu, J. Gu, and C. C. Loy, "Glean: Generative latent bank for large-factor image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 14245–14254.
- [27] M. Bertalmio, G. Sapiro, V. Caselles, and C. Ballester, "Image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques*, 2000, pp. 417–424.
- [28] A. A. Efros and W. T. Freeman, "Image quilting for texture synthesis and transfer," in *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques*, 2001, pp. 341–346.
- [29] V. Kwatra, I. Essa, A. Bobick, and N. Kwatra, "Texture optimization for example-based synthesis," *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 795–802, 2005.
- [30] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. u. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [31] T. Yu, Z. Guo, X. Jin, S. Wu, Z. Chen, W. Li, Z. Zhang, and S. Liu, "Region normalization for image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 12733– 12740.
- [32] W. Xiong, J. Yu, Z. Lin, J. Yang, X. Lu, C. Barnes, and J. Luo, "Foreground-aware image inpainting," in *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2019.
- [33] H. Liu, B. Jiang, Y. Song, W. Huang, and C. Yang, "Rethinking image inpainting via a mutual encoder-decoder with feature equalizations," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16.* Springer, 2020, pp. 725–741.
- [34] Y. Li, S. Liu, J. Yang, and M.-H. Yang, "Generative face completion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 3911–3919.
- [35] D. Ulyanov, A. Vedaldi, and V. Lempitsky, "Instance normalization: The missing ingredient for fast stylization," arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.08022, 2016.
- [36] J. Hu, L. Shen, and G. Sun, "Squeeze-and-excitation networks," in Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2018, pp. 7132–7141.
- [37] T. Karras, S. Laine, M. Aittala, J. Hellsten, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila, "Analyzing and improving the image quality of stylegan," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 8110–8119.
- [38] J. Johnson, A. Alahi, and L. Fei-Fei, "Perceptual losses for realtime style transfer and super-resolution," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 694–711.
- [39] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556, 2014.
- [40] T. Miyato, T. Kataoka, M. Koyama, and Y. Yoshida, "Spectral normalization for generative adversarial networks," arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05957, 2018.
- [41] C. Doersch, S. Singh, A. Gupta, J. Sivic, and A. Efros, "What makes paris look like paris?" ACM Transactions on Graphics, vol. 31, no. 4, 2012.
- [42] T. Karras, T. Aila, S. Laine, and J. Lehtinen, "Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [43] B. Zhou, A. Lapedriza, A. Khosla, A. Oliva, and A. Torralba, "Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition," *IEEE Transactions* on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1452– 1464, 2017.
- [44] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli, "Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 600–612, 2004.
- [45] K. Wei, J. Yang, Y. Fu, D. Wipf, and H. Huang, "Single image reflection removal exploiting misaligned training data and network enhancements," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 8178–8187.
- [46] R. Grosse, M. K. Johnson, E. H. Adelson, and W. T. Freeman, "Ground truth dataset and baseline evaluations for intrinsic image algorithms," in 2009 IEEE 12th International Conference on Computer Vision. IEEE, 2009, pp. 2335–2342.

[47] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980, 2014.