

Feature-domain Adaptive Contrastive Distillation for Efficient Single Image Super-Resolution

HyeonCheol Moon, Jinwoo Jeong, and Sungjei Kim

Korea Electronics Technology Institutes

Seongnam-si, Republic of Korea

{hcmoon23, jinwoo.jeong, and sungjei.kim}@keti.re.kr

Abstract

Recently, CNN-based SISR has numerous parameters and high computational cost to achieve better performance, limiting its applicability to resource-constrained devices such as mobile. As one of the methods to make the network efficient, Knowledge Distillation (KD), which transfers teacher's useful knowledge to student, is currently being studied. More recently, KD for SISR utilizes Feature Distillation (FD) to minimize the Euclidean distance loss of feature maps between teacher and student networks, but it does not sufficiently consider how to effectively and meaningfully deliver knowledge from teacher to improve the student performance at given network capacity constraints. In this paper, we propose a feature-domain adaptive contrastive distillation (FACD) method for efficiently training lightweight student SISR networks. We show the limitations of the existing FD methods using Euclidean distance loss, and propose a feature-domain contrastive loss that makes a student network learn richer information from the teacher's representation in the feature domain. In addition, we propose an adaptive distillation that selectively applies distillation depending on the conditions of the training patches. The experimental results show that the student EDSR and RCAN networks with the proposed FACD scheme improves not only the PSNR of the entire benchmark datasets and scales, but also the subjective image quality compared to the conventional FD approaches.

1. Introduction

Single image super-resolution (SISR) is a method of generating a high-resolution image from a given low-resolution image [6]. It is an important task that can be applied to a variety of computer vision tasks, such as medical imaging [28], pattern and object recognition [3, 9]. In the prior works, interpolation and example-based methods have been applied to the SISR task [31, 36, 42]. However, both




Figure 1. Examples of limitations on FD with Euclidean loss [12, 27]. The teacher and student networks are student EDSR [22] with scale x2 image. Noted that FAKD* and LFD* indicate our reproduced results with the same experimental settings.

methods show performance limitations. Relatively recently, the advent of CNN-based SISR networks such as SRCNN [5] has provided outperformed the traditional SISR works. Since then, numerous CNN-based SISR networks have been proposed [6, 17, 18], and the network parameters and computational complexity have been increased to obtain better performance.

The complex SISR model has limitations in practical applications such as resource-constrained devices. For the resource-limited environment such as mobile or IoT devices, the efficient and lightweight SISR model is needed. To meet this demand, the lightweight SISR model which derives more efficient performance trade-off is being studied [12, 13, 23, 27, 34, 39, 40, 41]. Among the above-mentioned methods, KD [7] methods have the following distinctive advantages: 1) KD has the advantage of inheriting the knowledge of large teachers and improving performance without modifying the network structure which is already in place at the industrial site, 2) KD can be combined with pruning and network design methods by adding loss terms to achieve more performance improvement [1, 16].

KD is mainly used for classification and detection tasks [3, 32, 35]. The student network is trained to minimize




Figure 2. Examples of worse teacher case on EDSR with x2 SR. Noted that teacher and student networks are trained separately from scratch.

the distance between the labels of the student network and the soft labels of the teacher network in the classification task. However, this approach for SISR task shows a limitation in performance improvement [27, 29]. In order to solve the problem, Feature domain Distillation (FD) is additionally introduced to guide the training of the student network. Feature Affinity-based KD (FAKD) [12] proposed to transfer the intermediate feature knowledge of a larger teacher model to a lightweight student network. FAKD found that FD with image domain distillation helped to improve the distillation performance. After that, Local Feature Distillation/Local-Selective Feature Distillation (LFD/LSFD) [27] proposed the feature attention method, which selectively focuses on specific positions to extract refined feature information, to improve the simple distance-based feature distillation of FAKD. Both methods have in common that they use Euclidean distance as a metric to transfer the feature knowledge from teacher to student. As shown in Fig. 1, neither method completely solves the disadvantages of Euclidean distance-based loss such as the pattern loss and image blurring.

To overcome the limitations of Euclidean distance loss, contrastive loss for SISR has been studied in the KD scheme [25, 34]. Contrastive Self-Distillation (CSD) [34] proposed the scheme to explicitly transfer the knowledge from teacher to student using contrastive loss in the latent space of image domain and improved the distillation performance and texture restoration. However, in the SISR, this approach can reduce the efficiency of distillation because it cannot fully exploit the rich information of intermediate feature maps. Moreover, as shown in Fig. 2, the inference output of teacher network does not guarantee better performance for all patches. Those inappropriate inference results interfere with the training of the student network and need to be removed from the training process.

To address these issues, we propose a Feature-domain Adaptive Contrastive Distillation (FACD), which selectively transfers the teacher’s feature-domain knowledge

with contrastive loss. Our Feature-domain Contrastive Distillation (FCD) can solve the restoration of edges and patterns, and provide an improvement of the distillation performance compared to the Image-domain Contrastive Distillation (ICD) and CSD [34] by transferring well-refined feature knowledge to student effectively.

In addition, FAKD and LSFD, which use three intermediate feature maps for FD, do not account for attention at the feature map level. Since CNN-based SR networks have a cascading structure, we found that improper distillation at the top sequentially affects the bottom of the network. To this end, we assign the higher importance (attention) to the top of network and demonstrate it in the Section 5.

Finally, the percentage of inappropriate inference output of the teacher network is up to 5% for Enhanced Deep Residual Networks (EDSR) [22] and up to 11% for Residual Channel Attention Networks (RCAN) [38] network across all training patches. Since these patches can transfer incorrect knowledge to the student network, we adaptively adjust whether to apply FCD based on patch conditions during training. Combined with feature-domain contrastive loss, feature map level attention, and adaptive distillation, FACD achieves state-of-the-art performance over FD and excellent qualitative results. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We propose an algorithm called FCD that improves the efficiency of traditional FD and mitigates the loss of detailed texture that occurs in the FD method through an intermediate feature domain contrastive learning method which can refine and transfer useful representational knowledge to students.
2. We found that inappropriate teacher’s knowledge interfered with student learning. For the efficiency of distillation, we propose an algorithm called Feature-domain Adaptive Contrastive Distillation (FACD) that selectively applies FCD by comparing output patches derived from teacher and student networks with ground-truth.
3. We demonstrate the FACD achieves state-of-the-art performance over distance-based FD and excellent qualitative results. In particular, in terms of qualitative results, FACD shows outperformed edge and pattern reconstruction results. Furthermore, we show a various experimental analysis with ablation studies.

2. Related Works

2.1. Efficient Super Resolution Network

At first, the CNN-based SR model stacks deeper layers to improve performance, but this architecture caused a gradient vanishing. After that, VDSR [17] and DRCN [18] networks used deep stacking of residual blocks [11] to solve

this issue. In addition, EDSR [22] shows that Batch Normalization (BN) on the SISR model leads to normalization of the features, eliminating the flexibility of the model. Furthermore, EDSR uses the residual-scaling method to improve the instability of training due to the removal of BN. Recently, RCAN [38] and SAN [4] provide significant performance improvement by adopting the channel-attention mechanism.

However, deep layers, stacking blocks, and attention mechanisms require huge memory and computational costs for inference due to the large number of parameters, spatial and non-local operations, and are limited in their applicability to resource-constrained devices such as mobile or IoT devices. To adapt to these devices, it is essential to design an efficient network structure and optimize training schemes [8]. Since optimizing performance by only designing an efficient network structure is limited, the advanced training schemes consisting of pruning, quantization, and KD become even more important on resource-constrained devices. Among them, KD is attractive because it can provide additional performance improvements without changing the structure of the target model, which is already applied in industry. The details of this approach are described in the next section.

2.2. Feature domain Distillation for SISR

KD is a method to transfer knowledge from the teacher model to a lightweight student networks [7]. Distillation with the label domain (same as the image domain in SISR) shows better performance in the classification problem. However, in the regression problems like SISR, the solution space is huge, so single image domain KD is not an effective way to transfer knowledge [30]. Therefore, FD mainly proposed to effectively guide the training of the student network through Euclidean distance-based matching in the image and feature domain [12, 20, 27, 29].

First, FitNet [29] proposed the distillation in both image and feature domains. For FD, they use a simple regressor which is composed of 1×1 convolution layers due to the channel size of the teacher and student network is different. PISR [20] proposed to use ground-truth images as privileged information to make an encoder in the teacher network learn the degradation and subsampling of high-resolution images. For more efficient distillation, FAKD proposes a feature affinity-matrix-based KD framework by distilling the structural knowledge from a larger teacher model. Furthermore, the teacher supervision (TS) loss between the output super-resolution images of teacher and student is considered. In addition, LSFD proposed a feature attention method that adaptively focuses on the specific pixel to extract feature information by utilizing the difference map between the inference output of teacher and student. By merging FD with the adaptive functional attention

mechanism, LSFD showed the performance enhancement compared to other FD algorithms such as FAKD. However, these approaches did not completely solve the limitation of the Euclidean distance loss in subjective image quality.

2.3. Contrastive Learning

Contrastive loss is mainly proposed in self-supervised learning [15, 19] and is used to train images so that positive pairs stay close to each other, while negative pairs are far away [32, 34]. By maximizing the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence of the positive and negative pairs, the mutual information in the positive pair is maximized while both distributions are clearly distinguished. In other words, KD with contrastive loss optimizes the performance by maximizing mutual information between teacher and student while minimizing uncertainty between both networks. This means that as training progresses, the networks of teacher and student become gradually similar. In particular, in this approach, contrastive representation distillation (CRD) achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) results in the classification task by distillation with contrastive loss [32].

KD with contrastive loss [25, 34] in the image domain is proposed for SISR, and they have a slight performance improvement over other distillation approaches [12, 27]. In particular, CSD [34] proposed to use contrastive loss in the latent features of the image domain. Inspired by conventional FD and CSD, we focus on the improving distillation by using contrastive loss in the feature domain where the solution space in the regression task is smaller than image domain. Therefore, we propose a novel method of feature-domain contrastive distillation and introduce an adaptive KD approach to efficiently transfer knowledge from teacher networks.

3. Proposed Method

In this section, we describe the loss function of the proposed distillation method. The pipeline of our proposed FAKD framework is shown in Fig. 3. As shown in Fig. 3, the proposed FAKD performs distillation on both image and feature domains. In the image domain, output images of the teacher and ground-truth (GT) are used to KD for the student network, respectively. On the other hand, in the feature domain, FAKD performs with contrastive learning between the intermediate feature maps of the teacher and student [12, 27].

3.1. Adaptive Knowledge Distillation for SR

In this section, we describe the adaptive KD for efficient knowledge transfer from teacher networks. As shown in Fig. 2, interestingly, the output of the teacher network does not always guarantee better performance than students. We found that 5% and 11% on average of worse cases occur in EDSR and RCAN, respectively, in the training patches.




Figure 3. Overall architecture of Feature-domain Adaptive Contrastive Distillation (FACD)

These worse patches interfere with the efficiency of distillation. Therefore, we propose a simple but effective adaptive distillation method to optimize the distillation performance in both the image and feature domains. If the SR image of the student network is relatively closer to the ground truth than the SR image of the teacher network, we ignore these patches during training. The indicator of adaptive KD is formulated as:

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \|SR_i^S - GT_i\|_1 < \|SR_i^T - GT_i\|_1, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where α is the indicator of appropriate samples, and i is the index of the batch sample. If the distance from GT is farther from the teacher, the parameter of appropriate samples α_i is set to 0. Here, 0 value means that the patch is not used for distillation.

3.2. Contrastive Adaptive Distillation

Conventional FD has demonstrated that the efficiency of distillation lies in the feature domain rather than the image domain [12]. For this reason, previous FD methods for SISR have mainly focused on improving the distillation schemes in the feature domain. Nevertheless, the combination of feature distillation and image distillation has been shown to outperform a single refined feature distillation alone [12, 27]. Moreover, KD with contrastive loss improves the performance by enabling more explicit knowledge transfer from teacher networks [34]. Therefore, we apply the contrastive learning in the feature-domain to transfer richer information from intermediate features, and keep the Euclidean distance loss in the image-domain distillation to minimize the interference from contrastive learning. We describe the loss function for each domain separately.

First, we propose the loss function in the image domain with the adaptive KD indicator (α_i) as follows:

$$L_{SR} = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N (2 - \alpha_i) \|SR_i^S - GT_i\|_1 + \alpha_i \|SR_i^S - SR_i^T\|_1 \quad (2)$$

where SR^S , SR^T , and GT are the output images of the student network, the teacher network, and ground-truth, respectively. N is the number of batch size. The former of L_{SR} means the Euclidean loss with GT, which is the loss term of the conventional SISR, and the latter means that distillation in the image domain.

Second, to transfer knowledge from intermediate features of teacher networks, we propose the feature domain adaptive contrastive distillation named FACD. For a fair comparison with the conventional FD methods [12, 27], FACD configured the three feature matching points as shown in Fig. 3. The detailed loss function of FACD is formulated as:

$$\hat{F}_{ij} = \frac{F_{ij}}{\|F_{ij}\|_2} \quad (3)$$

$$L_{FACD} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^3 w_j \frac{\alpha_i \|DR(\hat{F}_{ij}^S) - \hat{F}_{ij}^T\|_1}{\sum_{k=1}^K \|DR(\hat{F}_{ij}^S) - \hat{F}_{kj}^{Neg}\|_1} \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{F}_{ij}$ is the normalized feature maps, w_j refers to the attention weight of each feature matching point, and DR refers to the deep regressor consisting of five 1×1 convolutional layers with PReLU activation [10]. In this paper, the feature map level attention parameter w_i is set to [0.5, 0.3, 0.2]. In addition, N refers to the number of batch sizes, and K refers to the number of negative pairs. To better transfer knowledge from teacher, the feature maps are normalized. As with Eq. (2), FD is not performed on inappropriate samples in positive pairs.

In order to use the contrastive loss on feature domain, it is necessary to decide how to construct the positive and negative pairs, and which similarity measures (e.g. Euclidean,

dot-product, and cosine similarity (CS)) to use in the contrastive loss function.

For our FACD loss, as shown in Fig. 3, we consider the feature of the student network (F_{ij}^S) and its feature of the teacher network (F_{ij}^T) as a positive pair in the same index. To increase the efficiency of contrastive distillation, as shown in Fig. 3, all features of teacher and student except for the same index are considered as the negative pairs. To generate more negative samples, pairs with the different index on the student’s features (F_{ij}^S, F_{kj}^S) are also considered as the negative pairs. Moreover, we adopted the contrastive loss with Euclidean loss as similarity measure.

By minimizing this L_{FACD} , the student network learns to place positive pairs closer and negative pairs further apart. Through this approach, the mutual information between the feature maps of the teacher and student networks can be maximized [32]. The effectiveness of contrastive loss on each domain is described in our ablation studies.

3.3. Overall Loss Function

The overall loss function of our FACD is constructed by image and feature domain contrastive distillation, which can be formulated as Eq. (5):

$$L_{total} = L_{SR} + \lambda L_{FACD} \quad (5)$$

where λ is a hyper-parameter for balancing L_{SR} and L_{FACD} . The hyperparameter of the λ is set to 4 in our experimental settings.

4. Experiments

In this section, we explain the details of our experimental network settings and analyze the experimental results both quantitatively and qualitatively.

4.1. Experimental Settings

Following the previous works [4, 12, 22, 27, 34, 38], we use the 800 split set images from the DIV2K dataset [33] for training. On the other hand, we test our FACD with Y-PSNR on four benchmark datasets such as Set 5 [2], Set 14 [37], BSD 100 [24], and Urban 100 [14]. For comparison with previous KD algorithms, we performed experiments on existing SISR networks, EDSR [22] and RCAN [38]. Table 1 demonstrated the configuration of distillation models consisting of teacher and student networks. The configuration of the distillation model is the same as in the previous works for fair experimental comparison. While EDSR reduces the number of residual blocks (ResBlocks) and the channel size of the convolutional, RCAN keeps the number of residual groups (ResGroups) containing multiple ResBlocks, but only reduces the number of ResBlocks. This distillation compresses EDSR about 30 times and RCAN about 3 times in terms of the number of parameters.

Our FACD is implemented by PyTorch 1.8.0 with NVIDIA TITAN RTX GPU. All the student networks using distillation are trained using the ADAM optimizer with default hyperparameters in PyTorch. Unlike the previous work setting (200 [12] or 300 [27] epochs), FACD loss is not sufficiently saturated. Therefore, the batch size and total epochs are set to 16 (same as in the previous works) and 600 epochs, respectively. The initial learning rate is set to 2×10^{-4} , and is halved at 150 epochs. In addition, the patch size for training is set to 48×48 for network input, and default settings of data augmentation (e.g. horizontal flip, vertical flip, and random rotation) is applied. These experimental settings for reproduced results are equally applied to FAKD[12] and LFD[27] which are main comparison works in this paper.

Table 1. Network descriptions of teacher and student networks. T and S denote the teacher and student network respectively.

	EDSR		RCAN	
	T	S	T	S
Channel size	256	64	64	64
ResBlocks	32	16	20	6
ResGroups	-	-	10	10
Params (M)	43	1.5	15.59	5.17

4.2. Quantitative Results

The quantitative result (PSNR) is shown in Table 2. FACD achieves the best performance on almost benchmark datasets and scale factors except for the Set 5 data set on EDSR x4. The average performance improvement of EDSR and RCAN is about 0.1dB over conventional FD. The performance improvement of RCAN is better than that of EDSR. The biggest difference between EDSR and RCAN is the presence or absence of feature-attention blocks. This means that it is effective to make the features more similar in RCAN using the feature attention scheme. In other words, the knowledge of teachers can be better utilized in RCAN than EDSR on feature domain.

Impact on scale factor: Table 3 summarizes the evaluation results of Table 2. PSNR improvement averages the difference between the FACD and the overall FD performance in the Table 2. As shown in Table 3, we confirmed that the efficiency of performance improvement of FACD over other FD decreases as the scale factor increases. In general, the performance improvement efficiency of scale x2 is about two times better than that of scale x4. As the scale factor increases, the texture restoration becomes more difficult, and limits the upper bound of the performance of the teacher network. This means that the knowledge to be transmitted by the teacher is limited at a larger scale factor.

Performance on Urban100: Benchmark datasets for SISR each have their own data characteristics. For instance, Set5

Table 2. Quantitative results (PSNR) measured by applying different FD methods on the student EDSR and RCAN network, as shown in Table 1. Note that the computational cost of inference stage for each FD method is the same. FAKD and FitNet indicate LSFD paper results, CSD* and LFD* indicate our reproduced results with our experimental settings. Except for them, the results in the table are taken from their respective paper. The best performance in the same experimental settings is marked in **bold**.

EDSR						RCAN					
Methods	Scale	Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100	Methods	Scale	Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100
Teacher	x2	38.190	33.857	32.351	32.873	Teacher	x2	38.271	34.126	32.390	33.176
Student		37.919	33.439	32.102	31.728	Student		38.074	33.623	32.199	32.317
FAKD		37.976	33.523	32.156	31.906	FitNet		38.132	33.759	32.253	32.460
LFD		37.984	33.547	32.156	31.896	FAKD		38.164	33.815	32.274	32.533
LFD*	x2	37.986	33.528	32.159	31.935	LFD	x2	38.178	33.840	32.296	32.669
LSFD		37.991	33.529	32.157	31.936	LFD*		38.180	33.851	32.305	32.681
CSD*		38.001	33.536	32.160	31.944	LSFD		38.189	33.882	32.323	32.704
FACD (ours)		38.043	33.588	32.188	32.072	FACD (ours)		38.242	34.016	32.334	32.878
Teacher	x3	34.547	30.435	29.167	28.470	Teacher	x3	34.758	30.627	29.309	29.104
Student		34.272	30.266	29.044	27.959	Student		34.557	30.408	29.162	28.482
FAKD		34.356	30.296	29.066	28.016	FitNet		34.570	30.466	29.184	28.493
LFD		34.348	30.287	29.068	27.999	FAKD		34.653	30.449	29.208	28.523
LFD*	x3	34.333	30.301	29.077	28.022	LFD	x3	34.657	30.525	29.224	28.665
LSFD		34.384	30.302	29.077	28.029	LFD*		34.659	30.515	29.226	28.672
CSD*		34.378	30.309	29.082	28.020	LSFD		34.666	30.510	29.226	28.689
FACD (ours)		34.394	30.333	29.103	28.125	FACD (ours)		34.729	30.563	29.262	28.818
Teacher	x4	32.385	28.741	27.661	26.425	Teacher	x4	32.638	28.851	27.748	26.748
Student		32.102	28.526	27.538	25.905	Student		32.321	28.688	27.634	26.340
FAKD		32.138	28.547	27.557	25.972	FitNet		32.417	28.716	27.660	26.406
LFD		32.107	28.524	27.552	25.962	FAKD		32.461	28.750	27.678	26.422
LFD*	x4	32.099	28.557	27.546	25.962	LFD	x4	32.475	28.783	27.693	26.542
LSFD		32.107	28.548	27.563	25.980	LFD*		32.479	28.774	27.688	26.547
CSD*		32.112	28.563	27.569	25.998	LSFD		32.497	28.711	27.699	26.525
FACD (ours)		32.128	28.580	27.580	26.029	FACD (ours)		32.540	28.810	27.708	26.606

Table 3. Evaluation results on average PSNR improvement over other FD approaches. Performance improvement over 0.1dB is marked in underlined.

Model	scale	Set 5	Set 14	B100	Urban100
EDSR	x2	+0.059	+0.056	+0.031	<u>+0.149</u>
	x3	+0.034	+0.030	+0.031	<u>+0.108</u>
	x4	+0.016	+0.033	+0.025	+0.056
RCAN	x2	+0.073	<u>+0.169</u>	+0.045	<u>+0.229</u>
	x3	+0.089	+0.072	+0.050	<u>+0.211</u>
	x4	+0.074	+0.062	+0.024	<u>+0.118</u>

and 14 are samples of simple objects, and BSD100 has various characteristics from natural images to complex textures. Urban100 dataset has a variety and repetition of patterns and edges that arise from the complex architecture of buildings. As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, FACD has better quantitative performance, especially on the Urban100 dataset compared to other datasets. This means that our FACD has an advantage over other FD approach for texture restoration. Our FACD achieves 0.66dB, 0.34dB, and 0.17dB PSNR improvement over baseline student, FAKD, and LSFD on scale 2 in RCAN network, respectively.

Comparison with pruning methods: To further demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed FD methods, we ad-

ditionally compared the evaluation results with SOTA pruning methods such as ASSL [40] and SRP [41]. FLOPs measure when the output image size is set to $3 \times 1280 \times 720$. For a fair comparison, the configuration of the student model for KD was set to be as close as possible to the computational cost of each pruned EDSR sub-network model. As shown in Table 4, FACD achieves 0.02 dB improvement in PSNR over the SOTA pruning methods at smaller network sizes.

4.3. Qualitative Results

As shown in Fig. 4, we compare our FACD with other previous works on Urban100 benchmark dataset in terms of qualitative results. To compare the difference in the restoration of detailed patterns, we compared them to a relatively small cropped images. PSNR scores are calculated by considering only the cropped image. In general, as shown in the qualitative results, PSNR is proportional to the subjective image quality. We have clearly confirmed that our FACD achieves better PSNR and qualitative results than other FD approaches. Especially, for the restoration of textures (e.g. patterns), our FACD provides a clearer texture and is more similar to both the teacher and HR images than other FD methods. In the case of scale x3 images (092 from Urban 100), PSNR of FACD and LFD is not significantly differ-

Table 4. PSNR (dB) results on the Set5 (x2) in the EDSR sub-network. Note that ASSL [40] and SRP[41] indicate the original paper results. The best performance is marked in **bold**.

Params (K)		FLOPs (G)		Pruning				KD
Pruning	Ours	Pruning	Ours	Scratch	L1-norm [21]	ASSL [40]	SRP [41]	FACD (ours)
1101.8	1087.2	254.5	251.1	37.85	37.91	37.94	37.97	37.99
681.1	678.5	157.5	156.9	37.81	37.81	37.91	37.89	37.93
381.8	378.8	88.9	88.2	37.75	37.73	37.82	37.84	37.86
154.2	153.8	36.5	36.2	37.56	37.58	37.70	37.71	37.73
26.9	26.2	7.3	7.1	36.74	36.87	37.23	37.28	37.31




Figure 4. Qualitative results on EDSR with scale x3 and x4. Noted that FAKD* and LFD* indicate our reproduced results with the same experimental settings.

ent, but it shows a larger difference in the reconstruction of patterns that has been distorted by the conventional student networks. In other case (076 from Urban 100, x4), it shows a difference in the sharpness of the line and the straightness.

5. Ablation Study

This section demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed FACD approach and we conduct an ablation study to analyze the contrastive loss, the effectiveness of each loss component, and adaptive distillation.

Impact on contrastive loss domains: To show the effectiveness of contrastive loss in the feature domain, we compared the contrastive loss results in the feature and image domains. The composition of contrastive loss such as the formation of the equation is the same except for the applied domain. As shown in Table 5, our FCD achieves better results than ICD and CSD. Feature-domain contrastive distillation achieves 0.04dB PSNR improvement over the image-

Table 5. Ablation study (PSNR) on the contrastive loss comparison between image and feature domains (x2, EDSR). FCD refers to a method that removes the adaptive scheme from the FACD. CSD* indicates our reproduced results with our experimental settings.

Methods	Distillation Domain	Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100
ICD	Image	37.983	33.558	32.159	32.020
CSD* [34]	VGG features of image	38.001	33.536	32.160	31.944
FCD(ours)	Intermediate features	38.025	33.581	32.183	32.064

domain contrastive distillation.

Impact on contrastive loss formulation: InfoNCE loss has been mainly used in contrastive learning on unsupervised learning [26]. Similarity measure of contrastive loss in InfoNCE loss used the dot-product operation. In other hands, our FACD used the Euclidean distance loss as a similarity measure for contrastive loss. As shown in Table 6, Contrastive loss with Euclidean loss achieves the 0.02dB PSNR improvement over the InfoNCE loss.

Table 6. Ablation study (PSNR) of the different contrastive loss (L_{FACD}) on EDSR x2.

Methods	Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100
FCD(InfoNCE)	38.005	33.556	32.173	32.028
FCD(ours)	38.025	33.581	32.183	32.064

Impact on each loss component: In order to confirm the effect on the performance of each loss component, the loss component is turned on/off and tested. L1_GT is the conventional Euclidean loss over GT images and LT_T is the image domain distillation loss. The difference between FCD and FACD is the presence of adaptive distillation. The overall results are shown in Table 7. Compared with the baseline model without distillation, our distillation approach achieved significant performance improvement on all benchmark datasets.

Table 7 in the 4th row shows that training also works well for the independent application of distillation without L1_GT. In particular, the FCD or FACD components show a larger performance improvement over the other loss components, as shown by the performance difference between the 1st row and the 3rd row. This means that the proposed FCD or FACD provide the knowledge from the teacher to the student network effectively. Finally, the combination of

all loss components achieves the best evaluation results on various benchmark datasets.

Table 7. Ablation study (PSNR) on the effectiveness of each loss component in the RCAN network (x4). The best performance is marked in **bold**.

Loss Component				Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100
L1_GT	L1_T	FCD	FACD				
✓				32.321	28.688	27.634	26.340
✓	✓			32.362	28.722	27.657	26.402
✓		✓		32.425	28.738	27.669	26.507
	✓	✓		32.447	28.768	27.671	26.524
✓	✓	✓		32.492	28.774	27.689	26.562
✓	✓		✓	32.540	28.810	27.708	26.606

Impact on adaptive KD: In this Section 3.1, we describe the effectiveness of worse cases of the teacher networks. In order to confirm the effect of performance with worse samples of teacher networks, we compared the quantitative results of our FACD and FCD (FACD without an adaptive distillation approach). As shown in Table 8, except for Set5 and 14 in scale 4 (EDSR), FACD achieves 0.02dB PSNR improvement over the FCD. This ablation study confirms the importance of the adaptive distillation approach.

Table 8. Ablation study (PSNR) on the effectiveness of adaptive distillation methods in the EDSR and RCAN networks. FCD indicates feature-domain contrastive distillation without adaptive distillation. The better performance is marked in **bold**.

Methods	Scale	Model			
		EDSR		RCAN	
		B100	Urban100	B100	Urban100
FCD	x2	32.183	32.064	32.331	32.851
FACD		32.188	32.072	32.334	32.878
FCD	x3	29.096	28.124	29.242	28.771
FACD		29.103	28.125	29.262	28.818
FCD	x4	27.578	26.013	27.689	26.562
FACD		27.580	26.029	27.708	26.606

Impact on feature attention: In this paper, the three intermediate feature matching points are configured for fair FD comparison. In order to compare the effect of each feature, we compared the evaluation results of attention of each feature point. The only difference among three methods is the composition of the w_j in Eq. (4). As shown in Table 9, FCD with our attention version (FAT) achieves the best PSNR score over the attention of other feature matching points. This means that due to the cascading architecture of the CNN-based SR network, the upper part has more influence on the distillation performance than the bottom part.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose the feature-domain adaptive contrastive distillation (FACD) scheme for efficient super-resolution models. In order to better transfer knowledge from the teacher networks, we proposed FD with the contrastive loss which is to maximize the mutual information of

Table 9. Ablation study (PSNR) of the feature attention on EDSR x2. FAA, FAB, and FAT indicate paying attention to the average, bottom, and top parts of features matching points, respectively. FAU is the version of this paper. The better performance is marked in **bold**.

Methods	$[w_1, w_2, w_3]$	Set5	Set14	B100	Urban100
FCD(FAA)	[0.33, 0.33, 0.33]	38.007	33.579	32.177	32.058
FCD(FAB)	[0.20, 0.30, 0.50]	37.998	33.577	32.175	32.050
FCD(FAT)	[0.50, 0.30, 0.20]	38.025	33.581	32.183	32.064

features between student and teacher networks. In addition, we found that inappropriate inference results of teacher networks decreased the efficiency of FD. To solve this issue, we propose the adaptive distillation scheme by rejecting the inaccurate teacher’s knowledge transfer during the KD process. The student networks of EDSR and RCAN with FACD achieve state-of-the-art (SOTA) results in the KD for SISR. In particular, our FACD achieves excellent qualitative results in terms of texture reconstructions. We believe that the proposed FACD approach can be applied to other computer vision tasks (e.g. detection, segmentation, and denoising).

References

- [1] Nima Aghli and Eraldo Ribeiro. Combining weight pruning and knowledge distillation for cnn compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3191–3198, 2021. 1
- [2] Marco Bevilacqua, Aline Roumy, Christine Guillemot, and Marie Line Alberi-Morel. Low-complexity single-image super-resolution based on nonnegative neighbor embedding. 2012. 5
- [3] Guobin Chen, Wongun Choi, Xiang Yu, Tony Han, and Manmohan Chandraker. Learning efficient object detection models with knowledge distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 1
- [4] Tao Dai, Jianrui Cai, Yongbing Zhang, Shu-Tao Xia, and Lei Zhang. Second-order attention network for single image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11065–11074, 2019. 3, 5
- [5] Chao Dong, Chen Change Loy, Kaiming He, and Xiaoou Tang. Image super-resolution using deep convolutional networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 38(2):295–307, 2015. 1
- [6] William T Freeman, Egon C Pasztor, and Owen T Carmichael. Learning low-level vision. *International journal of computer vision*, 40(1):25–47, 2000. 1
- [7] Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J Maybank, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129(6):1789–1819, 2021. 1, 3
- [8] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*, 2015. 3

- [9] Khizar Hayat. Multimedia super-resolution via deep learning: A survey. *Digital Signal Processing*, 81:198–217, 2018. 1
- [10] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1026–1034, 2015. 4
- [11] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. 2
- [12] Zibin He, Tao Dai, Jian Lu, Yong Jiang, and Shu-Tao Xia. Fakd: Feature-affinity based knowledge distillation for efficient image super-resolution. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 518–522, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- [13] Zejiang Hou and Sun-Yuan Kung. Efficient image super resolution via channel discriminative deep neural network pruning. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3647–3651. IEEE, 2020. 1
- [14] Jia-Bin Huang, Abhishek Singh, and Narendra Ahuja. Single image super-resolution from transformed self-exemplars. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5197–5206, 2015. 5
- [15] Ashish Jaiswal, Ashwin Ramesh Babu, Mohammad Zaki Zadeh, Debapriya Banerjee, and Fillia Makedon. A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies*, 9(1):2, 2020. 3
- [16] Jangho Kim, Simyung Chang, and Nojun Kwak. Pqk: Model compression via pruning, quantization, and knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14681*, 2021. 1
- [17] Jiwon Kim, Jung Kwon Lee, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Accurate image super-resolution using very deep convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1646–1654, 2016. 1, 2
- [18] Jiwon Kim, Jung Kwon Lee, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Deeply-recursive convolutional network for image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1637–1645, 2016. 1, 2
- [19] Minseon Kim, Jihoon Tack, and Sung Ju Hwang. Adversarial self-supervised contrastive learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2983–2994, 2020. 3
- [20] Wonkyung Lee, Junghyup Lee, Dohyung Kim, and Bumsuh Ham. Learning with privileged information for efficient image super-resolution. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 465–482. Springer, 2020. 3
- [21] Hao Li, Asim Kadav, Igor Durdanovic, Hanan Samet, and Hans Peter Graf. Pruning filters for efficient convnets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08710*, 2016. 7
- [22] Bee Lim, Sanghyun Son, Heewon Kim, Seungjun Nah, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Enhanced deep residual networks for single image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 136–144, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 5
- [23] Ziwei Luo, Youwei Li, Lei Yu, Qi Wu, Zhihong Wen, Haoqiang Fan, and Shuaicheng Liu. Fast nearest convolution for real-time efficient image super-resolution, 2022. 1
- [24] David Martin, Charless Fowlkes, Doron Tal, and Jitendra Malik. A database of human segmented natural images and its application to evaluating segmentation algorithms and measuring ecological statistics. In *Proceedings Eighth IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision. ICCV 2001*, volume 2, pages 416–423. IEEE, 2001. 5
- [25] HyeonCheol Moon, Yong-Hoon Kwon, JinWoo Jeong, and SungJei Kim. Compression of super-resolution model using contrastive learning. In *Proceeding of the Korean Institute of Broadcast and Media Engineers Conference*, pages 557–559, 2022. 2, 3
- [26] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018. 7
- [27] SeongUk Park and Nojun Kwak. Local-selective feature distillation for single image super-resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10988*, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- [28] Defu Qiu, Lixin Zheng, Jianqing Zhu, and Detian Huang. Multiple improved residual networks for medical image super-resolution. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 116:200–208, 2021. 1
- [29] Adriana Romero, Nicolas Ballas, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Antoine Chassang, Carlo Gatta, and Yoshua Bengio. Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550*, 2014. 2, 3
- [30] Muhamad Risqi U Saputra, Pedro PB De Gusmao, Yasin Al-malioglu, Andrew Markham, and Niki Trigoni. Distilling knowledge from a deep pose regressor network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 263–272, 2019. 3
- [31] Zhenfeng Shao, Lei Wang, Zhongyuan Wang, and Juan Deng. Remote sensing image super-resolution using sparse representation and coupled sparse autoencoder. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(8):2663–2674, 2019. 1
- [32] Yonglong Tian, Dilip Krishnan, and Phillip Isola. Contrastive representation distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10699*, 2019. 1, 3, 5
- [33] Radu Timofte, Eirikur Agustsson, Luc Van Gool, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Lei Zhang. Ntire 2017 challenge on single image super-resolution: Methods and results. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 114–125, 2017. 5
- [34] Yanbo Wang, Shaohui Lin, Yanyun Qu, Haiyan Wu, Zhizhong Zhang, Yuan Xie, and Angela Yao. Towards compact single image super-resolution via contrastive self-distillation. In Zhi-Hua Zhou, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pages 1122–1128. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021. Main Track. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
- [35] Enze Xie, Jian Ding, Wenhai Wang, Xiaohang Zhan, Hang Xu, Peize Sun, Zhenguo Li, and Ping Luo. Detco: Unsuper-vised contrastive learning for object detection. In *Proceed-*

- ings of the *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8392–8401, 2021. 1
- [36] Jianchao Yang, John Wright, Thomas S Huang, and Yi Ma. Image super-resolution via sparse representation. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 19(11):2861–2873, 2010. 1
 - [37] Roman Zeyde, Michael Elad, and Matan Protter. On single image scale-up using sparse-representations. In *International conference on curves and surfaces*, pages 711–730. Springer, 2010. 5
 - [38] Yulun Zhang, Kunpeng Li, Kai Li, Lichen Wang, Bineng Zhong, and Yun Fu. Image super-resolution using very deep residual channel attention networks. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 286–301, 2018. 2, 3, 5
 - [39] Yulun Zhang, Huan Wang, Can Qin, and Yun Fu. Aligned structured sparsity learning for efficient image super-resolution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2695–2706, 2021. 1
 - [40] Yulun Zhang, Huan Wang, Can Qin, and Yun Fu. Aligned structured sparsity learning for efficient image super-resolution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2695–2706, 2021. 1, 6, 7
 - [41] Yulun Zhang, Huan Wang, Can Qin, and Yun Fu. Learning efficient image super-resolution networks via structure-regularized pruning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 1, 6, 7
 - [42] Fei Zhou, Wenming Yang, and Qingmin Liao. Interpolation-based image super-resolution using multisurface fitting. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 21(7):3312–3318, 2012. 1