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Abstract

Super-resolution (SR) is a fundamental and representative task of low-level vision area. It is generally thought that the features extracted from the SR network have no specific semantic information, and the network simply learns complex non-linear mappings from input to output. Can we find any “semantics” in SR networks? In this paper, we give affirmative answers to this question. By analyzing the feature representations with dimensionality reduction and visualization, we successfully discover the deep semantic representations in SR networks, i.e., deep degradation representations (DDR), which relate to the image degradation types and degrees. We also reveal the differences in representation semantics between classification and SR networks. Through extensive experiments and analysis, we draw a series of observations and conclusions, which are of great significance for future work, such as interpreting the intrinsic mechanisms of low-level CNN networks and developing new evaluation approaches for blind SR.

1. Introduction

The emergence of deep convolutional neural network (CNN) has given birth to a large number of new solutions to low-level vision tasks [7, 42, 41]. Among these progresses, image super-resolution (SR) has enjoyed a great performance leap. Compared with traditional methods (e.g., interpolation [15] and sparse coding [35, 36]), SR networks are able to produce more visually pleasing results with improved efficiency.

However, even if we have benefited a lot from the powerful CNNs, we have little knowledge about what happens in SR networks and what on earth distinguishes them from traditional approaches. Does the performance gain merely come from more complex mapping functions? Or is there anything different inside SR networks, like classification networks with discriminative capability? On the other hand, as a classic regression task, SR is expected to perform a continuous mapping from LR to HR images. It is generally a local operation without the consideration of global context. But with the introduction of GAN-based models [19, 32], more delicate SR textures can be generated. It seems that the network has learned some kind of semantic, which is beyond our common perception for regression tasks.

Then, we may raise the question: are there any “semantics” in SR networks? If yes, do these semantics have different definitions from those in classification networks? Existing literatures cannot answer these questions, as there is little research on interpreting low-level vision deep models. Nevertheless, to discover the semantics in SR networks is of great importance. It can not only help us further understand the underlying working mechanisms, but also guide us to design better networks and evaluation algorithms.

In this study, we give affirmative answers to the above questions by unfolding the semantics hidden in super-resolution networks. Specifically, different from the artificially predefined semantics associated with object classes in high-level vision, semantics in SR networks are distinct in terms of image degradations instead of image contents. Thus, the semantics in this paper have different indications for SR and classification networks. More interestingly, such degradation-related semantics are spontaneously existing, without involving relevant data or pre-labelling. Our observation stems from a representative blind SR method – CinCGAN [37], and we further extend it to more common SR networks – SRResNet and SRGAN [19]. We have also revealed more interesting phenomena to help interpret the semantics, including the analogy to classification networks, the influential factors for semantic discovery, and the distinction of different degradations. We believe our findings could lay the groundwork for the interpretability of SR net-
works, and inspire better solutions for more challenging tasks, like blind SR for real-world images.

In summary, our contributions are mainly four-fold. 1) We have successfully discovered the “semantics” in SR networks, denoted as deep degradation representations (DDR). 2) We reveal the differences of semantics between classification and SR networks, for the first time. 3) We introduce a set of simple yet potential approach in analyzing and extracting the semantic information in SR networks. 4) Through extensive experiments and analysis, we draw a series of interesting observations and conclusions on DDR, which are of great significance for future work.

2. Related Work

Super-resolution. Super-resolution (SR) is a fundamental and representative task in low-level vision, which aims to reconstruct the high-resolution (HR) image from the corresponding low-resolution (LR) counterpart. SRCNN [7] is the first proposed CNN-based method for SR. Since then, a large number of deep-learning-based SR methods have been developed [8, 21, 43, 19, 42]. Generally, current CNN-based SR methods can be categorized into two groups. One is MSE-based method, which targets at minimizing the distortion (e.g., Mean Square Error) between the ground-truth HR image and super-resolved image to yield high PSNR values, such as SRCNN [7], FSRCNN [8], VDSR [16], EDSR [21], RCAN [43], SAN [5], etc. The other is GAN-based method, which incorporates generative adversarial network (GAN) and perceptual loss [14] to obtain realistic and perceptually pleasing results, such as SRGAN [19], ESRGAN [32], RankSRGAN [42], SROBB [26]. Recently, blind SR has attracted more and more attention [10, 2, 23, 31], since it targets at solving the most challenging scenarios with real-world degradation. A comprehensive survey for blind SR is newly proposed [22], which summarizes and compares the ideas and performance of existing methods. In this paper, we regard SR as a representative research object, and study its deep semantic representations, which can also draw inspirations on other low-level vision tasks.

Network interpretability. At present, most existing works on neural network interpretability focus on high-level vision tasks, especially for image classification. In a recent survey paper, Zhang et al. [44] systematically reviewed existing literatures on network interpretability and proposed a novel taxonomy to categorize them. Here we only discuss several classic works. By adopting deconvolutional networks [40], Zeiler et al. [39] projected the downsampled low-resolution feature activations back to the input pixel space, and then performed a sensitivity analysis to reveal which parts of the image are important for classification. Simonyan et al. [28] generated a saliency map from the gradients through a single backpropagation pass. Based on class activation maps (CAM) [45], Selvaraju et al. [27] proposed Grad-CAM (Gradient-weighted CAM) to produce a coarse-grained attribution map of the important regions in the image, which was broadly applicable to any CNN-based architectures. For more information about the network interpretability literatures, please refer to the survey paper [44]. However, for low-level vision tasks, similar researches are rare. Most recently, a novel attribution approach called local attribution map (LAM) [9] was proposed to interpret super-resolution networks, which was used to localize the input features that influenced the network outputs. It inherited the previous gradient-guided attribution methods but was specially designed for SR networks. In our work, we interpret SR networks from another new perspective. We dive into their feature representations, and discover the deep semantics of SR networks. For more background knowledge, please refer to the supplementary file.

Figure 1. Different degraded input images and their corresponding outputs produced by CinCGAN [37] and BM3D [4]: (a) DIV2K-mild, (b) DIV2K-noise20 and (c) Hollywood. CinCGAN [37] is trained on DIV2K-mild dataset in an unpaired manner. If the input image conforms to the training data distribution, CinCGAN will generate better restoration results than BM3D, i.e., (a). Otherwise, it fails to deal with the input images (b)&(c). More specifically, it tends to ignore unseen noise/artifacts and keeps the input images untouched. On the other hand, the traditional method BM3D [4] has a stable performance and similar denoising effects on all input images, regardless of the input degradations. Please zoom in for best view.
3. Motivation

To discover semantics, we start with the scenario that could easily distinguish SR networks and traditional methods. It is well known that SR networks are superior to traditional methods in supervised learning, but are inferior in generalization ability. Thus, we select the blind SR task, where the degradation models are unknown and the testing should be performed across different datasets. Traditional methods generally have a stable performance, and treat different images equally without distinction of degradation types. How about the SR networks, especially those designed for blind SR task?

CinCGAN is a representative solution for real-world SR without paired training data. It maps a degraded LR to its clean version using data distribution learning before conducting SR operation. However, we find that, even if CinCGAN is developed for blind setting, it still has a limited application scope: if the degradation of the input image is not included in the training data, CinCGAN will fail to transfer the degraded input to a clean one. More interestingly, instead of producing extra artifacts in the image, it seems that CinCGAN does not process the input image and retain all the original defects. Readers can refer to Fig. for an illustration, where CinCGAN performs well on testing image of DIV2K-mild dataset (same distribution as its training data), but produces unchanged results for other images with different degradation types. In other words, the network seems to figure out the specific degradation types within its training data distribution, and any distribution mismatch will make the network “turn off” its ability. For comparison, we further process the above three types of degraded images by a traditional denoising method BM3D. As shown in Fig. for all input images with different degradation types, BM3D has a obvious and stable denosing performance. Although the results of BM3D may be mediocre (the image textures and details are largely over-smoothed), it does try to process every input image. This observation reveals that there is a significant discrepancy between traditional method and CNN-based method.

The above interesting phenomenon indicates that the network has learned more than a regression function, since it demonstrates the ability to distinguish among different degradation types. Inspired by this observation, we try to find any semantics hidden in CinCGAN, as well as in other SR networks.

4. Digging Out Semantics in Super-Resolution Networks

In this section, we first describe our analysis method. Then, we elaborate our findings on semantics in SR networks, as well as their differences from those in classification network.

4.1. Analysis Method

As stated in Sec CinCGAN treats LR inputs in different ways for different degradations. Since the final outputs are always derived from features in CNN layers, we start the exploration with feature maps, especially the deep ones potentially with more global and abstract information. To interpret the deep features of CNN, one common and rational way is to convert the high-dimensional CNN feature maps into lower-dimensional datapoints that can be visualized in a scatterplot. Afterwards, human can intuitively understand the data structures and the manifolds. Specifically, we adopt t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE), a popular algorithm in manifold learning, for dimensionality reduction. This technique can greatly capture the local structure of the high-dimensional data and simultaneously reveal global structure, such as the presence of clusters at several scales. Also, it has been successfully applied in previous works for feature projection and visualization. In all the experiments, we first reduce the dimensionality of feature maps to a reasonable amount (50 in this paper) using PCA, then apply t-SNE to project the 50-dimensional representation to two-dimensional space, after which the results are visualized in a scatterplot. Moreover, we also introduce several indicators to better illustrate and quantitatively evaluate the distributions of visualized datapoints. More details about the t-SNE and the introduced quantitative indicators are depicted in the supplementary file.

4.2. How do the Semantics in Super-Resolution Networks Look Like?

Equipped with the t-SNE technique, we extract features from the deep layers of CinCGAN for visualization. Specifically, as discussed in Sec CinCGAN performs dif-
Figure 3. Simplified diagrams of different architectures. (a) ResNet18 [11] for classification. “Conv2_x” represents the 2nd group of residual blocks. (b) SRResNet-wGR. Plain SRResNet [19] without image global residual. “RB1” represents the 1st residual block. (c) SRResNet-wGR, which learns the residual image.

frequently on various input datasets, we further compare the features generated from three different testing datasets: 1) DIV2K-mild: the original training and testing data in CinCGAN, which is synthesized from DIV2K [1] dataset. It contains noise, blur, pixel shifting and other degradations. 2) DIV2K-noise20: add Gaussian noises with noise level $\sigma = 20$ to the DIV2K set, making it perceptually similar to DIV2K-mild. 3) Hollywood100: 100 images selected from Hollywood dataset [18], containing real-world old film frames with unknown degradation. Each testing dataset includes 100 images.

The visualization results are shown in Fig.2(a). One can see that there exists a discriminative clustering for datapoints from the same dataset. While for different datasets, even if their image contents are the same, their corresponding datapoints still belong to different clusters. This observation conforms to our observation that CinCGAN does treat inputs with various degradations in different ways. More importantly, it naturally reveals the semantics contained in CinCGAN, which are closely related to the degradation types rather than image content.

**From CinCGAN to Generic SRGAN.** Based on the above findings, we are curious about whether this kind of degradation-related semantics is universal among SR networks, especially for supervised SR methods. Therefore, referring to [19, 32], we design a generic GAN-based SR architectures SRGAN-wGR to repeat the visualization experiment. Note that, here we adopt image global residual learning scheme where the generator is designed to learn

2Note that the class labels in the scatterplots are only used to assign a color/symbol to the datapoints for better visualization. The class information is not used by t-SNE to determine the spatial coordinates of the data after dimension reduction.

3SRGAN [19] is a renown GAN-based SR model, in which the generator consists of several stacked residual blocks. Following ESRGAN [32], we remove all the BN layers in the generator for better performance.
4.3. Differences in Semantics between Classification and Super-Resolution Networks

In this section, we directly compare the differences in representation semantics between classification and SR networks, aiming to reveal the uniqueness of degradation-related semantics for SR networks.

Classification is the most representative task in high-level vision, where artificially predefined semantic labels on object classes are given for target images. Due to the clearly defined semantics, classification networks are naturally endowed with semantic discrimination. Without loss of generality, we choose ResNet18 [11] as the classification backbone and conduct experiments on CIFAR10 dataset [17]. More results on various backbones are in the supplementary file. We extract the forward feature maps of each input testing image at different network layers. Fig. 3(a) concisely describes the architecture of ResNet18.

From the visualization results in Fig. 4, it can be observed that as the network deepens, the extracted feature representations produce obvious clusters, i.e., the learned features are increasingly becoming semantically discriminative. Further, such discriminative semantics in classification networks are coherent with the artificially predefined labels (semantic categories). This is an intuitive and natural observation, on which lots of representation and discriminative learning methods are based [34, 25, 20, 33].

Now, we compare the differences between classification and super-resolution networks in representation semantics. Specifically, we add blur and noise degradation to the CIFAR10 testing images, and then investigate the feature representations of classification and SR networks.

As shown in Fig. 5, after adding blur or noise to the data, the deep representations obtained by classification network (ResNet18) are still clustered by object categories, which indicates that the features extracted by the classification network focus more on high-level object class information, rather than low-level image degradation information. On the contrary, the deep representations obtained by SR networks (SRResNet-wGR and SRGAN-wGR) are clustered with regard to degradation types. In other words, features of the same object category are not clustered together, while those of the same degradation type are clustered together, showing different “semantic” discriminability from classification network. This phenomenon intuitively illustrates the differences in the deep semantic representations between SR and classification networks, i.e., degradation-related semantics and content-related semantics. Fig. 6 concisely illustrates the differences in semantics between classification and SR networks.
Figure 6. For classification networks, the semantics of deep feature representations are coherent with the artificially predefined labels (object categories). When training, each image is assigned with a specific object label as supervision signal. Thus, the networks learn to extract features that are discriminative for the object categories. Such semantic representations are artificially predefined and are dependent on the given training dataset. However, for super-resolution networks, the learned deep representations have different kind of “semantics” from classification. During training, the SR networks are only provided with bicubically downsampled LR images (without blur or noise), i.e., there is not any supervision signal related to image degradation information and there is no any data exposure to degraded images. Nevertheless, if we feed the trained SR networks with images with various degradations, the deep representations are spontaneously discriminative to different degradations. It is interesting that the SR networks can learn to extract features that are correlated with image degradation information, without any predefined labels or degradation priors. Notably, not arbitrary SR network has such property. In Sec. 5.1, we find two factors that can facilitate the SR network to extract such degradation-related representations, i.e., adversarial learning (GAN) and global residual learning (GR).

5. Further Investigation of Deep Degradation Representations

In the previous sections, we have established the notion of deep degradation representations (DDR) and drawn the significant observation on their differences from semantics in classification network. In this section, we further investigate the characteristics of DDR, and make some preliminary interpretations on the formation of DDR.

Moreover, we introduce Calinski-Harabaz Index (CHI) [3] to quantitatively evaluate the semantic discriminability, which can provide some rough yet practicable measures for reference. The CHI score is higher when clusters are well separated, which indicates stronger semantic discriminability. More details about the quantitative indicators are described in the supplementary file.

5.1. Two Factors for Discriminability of DDR

Although degradation-related semantics, i.e. DDR, have been dug out in SR networks, including CinCGAN, SRGAN-wGR and SRResNet-wGR, we further discovered in experiments that this semantic is not naturally discriminative for an arbitrary SR network structure. In this section, we introduce two crucial factors that can help effectively extract the above “semantic” information, i.e., image global residual learning (GR), and generative adversarial training (GAN-based). Based on GR, we demonstrate that there is a distinct discrepancy between MSE-based and GAN-based SR methods in feature representations: MSE-based methods have to exploit GR so as to obtain degradation-related semantics. Otherwise, the features are not discriminative for degradation information, especially for the blur degradation. GAN-based methods can obtain such semantics more easily, no matter whether there is GR or not (though GR can
Figure 7. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of SRResNet-woGR (1st row) and SRResNet-wGR (2nd row) using t-SNE. With image global residual (GR), the representations of MSE-based SR networks show discriminability to degradation types.

Figure 8. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of SRGAN-woGR (1st row) and SRGAN-wGR (2nd row) using t-SNE. Even without GR, GAN-based SR networks can still obtain deep degradation representations.

Global Residual Learning vs. Plain Learning. We train two SRResNet-like networks, one of which has a global residual (GR) path and the other does not, as shown in Fig. 3. Specifically, SRResNet-wGR learns the image residual through deep networks and adds it to the bilinearly upsampled input, while SRResNet-woGR directly learns to predict the final result from the input. Again, DIV2K [1] dataset is used for training, where the LR inputs are downsampled by bicubic interpolation from HR images as in most literatures. Readers can refer to the supplementary file for more details.

Similar to the analysis techniques in Sec. 4, after testing on three datasets, we first obtain the deep features extracted from different layers of the networks and then use t-SNE for visualization analysis. Results are shown in Fig. 7.

From the experimental results, we can draw the following important observations: 1) For MSE-based SR method, global residual learning (GR) is essential for producing discriminative feature representations on degradation types. To be specific, the features in “ResBlock16” of SRResNet-woGR have shown distinct discriminability, where the clean, blur, noise data are clustered separately. On the contrary, SRResNet-woGR shows no discriminability on such degradations even in deep layers. This phenomenon reveals that global residual has a paramount impact on the learned feature representations. It is inferred that learning the global residual could remove most of the content information of input image and make the network concentrate more on the contained degradation, thus the learned representations are discriminative. In Sec. 5.3, this claim is also corroborated by visualizing the feature maps: with GR, the learned feature maps tend to contain less information of image content (e.g., shape and structure). 2) As the network deepens, feature representations of SRResNet-wGR become more separable and discriminative. Note that this is similar to the discriminability of the feature representations in the classification network (Sec. 4.3), except that the representations here are discriminative to the degradation types. Note that VDSR [16] first introduces GR into SR, but with a different purpose as our paper. In VDSR, GR is mainly proposed for fast convergence and better SR results. It does all testing on clean data. We discover/interpret the function of GR from another perspective: when receiving different degraded inputs, GR can help the network extract more degradation-related features without prior data/labels that are involved...
with degradation information.

**MSE-based Method vs. GAN-based Method.** MSE-based and GAN-based method are currently two prevailing trends in CNN-based SR methods, among which the representatives are SRResNet and SRGAN. The optimization objective and loss functions of MSE-based and GAN-based SR methods are introduced in detail in the supplementary file. Previous studies only reveal that the visual effects of MSE-based and GAN-based methods are different, but the differences between their feature representations were rarely discussed. Since their learning mechanisms are quite different, will there be discrepancy in their deep feature representations? We will try to answer this question in the following.

For fair comparison, we adopt the same architectures as SRResNet-wGR and SRResNet-woGR to serve as the generators, and construct the discriminator adopted in SRGAN [19]. Consequently, we build two corresponding GAN-based models, namely SRGAN-wGR and SRGAN-woGR. After training, we perform the same test and analysis process mentioned earlier. The results are depicted in Fig. 8.

From the results, we obtain the following observations: 1) For GAN-based method, whether there is global residual (GR) or not, the deep features are bound to be discriminative to degradation types. As shown in Fig. 8(d), the deep representations in “ResBlock16” of SRGAN-woGR have already been clustered according to different degradation types. This clearly suggests that the learned deep representations of MSE-based method and GAN-based method are dissimilar. GAN-based method can obtain deep degradation representations without global residual. This also implies that adversarial learning can help the network learn more informative features for low-level degradations instead of image content. 2) Global residual can further enhance the representation discriminability to degradation types, as compared in Fig. 8(d) and Fig. 8(h). The quantitative evaluations are also in accordance with the visualization results. More quantitative analyses are included in the supplementary file.

### 5.2. Exploration on Different Degradation Degrees

In previous sections, we introduce deep degradation representations by showing that the deep representations of SR networks are discriminative to different degradation types (e.g., clean, blur and noise). How about the same degradation type but with different degraded degrees? Will the deep representations still be discriminative to them? To explore this question, more experiments and analysis are performed.

We test super-resolution networks on degraded images with different noise degrees and blur degrees. The results are depicted in Table. 1 and Fig. 9. It can be seen that the deep degradation representations are discriminative not only to cross-degradation (different degradation types) but also to intra-degradation (same degradation type but with different degrees). This suggests that even for the same type of degradation, different degradation degrees will also cause significant differences in features. The greater the difference between degradation degrees, the stronger the discriminability of feature representations. This also reflects another difference between the representation semantics of super-resolution network and classification network. For classification, the semantic discriminability of feature representations is generally discrete, because the semantics are associated with discrete object categories. Nevertheless, there appears to be a spectrum (continuous transition) for the discriminability of the deep degradation representations, i.e., the discriminability has a monotonic relationship with the divergence between degradation types and degrees. For example, the degradation difference between noise levels 10 and 20 is not that much distinct, and the discriminability of feature representations is relatively smaller, comparing with noise levels 10 and 30.

From Table 1, there are notable observations. 1) Comparing with blur degradation, noise degradation is easier to be discriminated. Yet, it is difficult to obtain deep representations that have strong discriminability for different blur levels. Even for GAN-based method, global residual (GR) is indispensable to obtain representations that can be discriminative to different blur levels. 2) The representations obtained by GAN-based method have more discriminative semantics to degradation types and degrees than those of MSE-based method. 3) Again, global residual can strengthen the representation discriminability for degradations.

### 5.3. Visualization of Feature Maps

So far, we have successfully revealed the degradation-related semantics in SR networks with dimensionality reduction. In this section, we directly visualize the deep feature maps extracted from SR networks to provide some intuitive and qualitative interpretations. Specifically, we extract the feature maps obtained from four models (SRResNet-wGR, SRResNet-woGR, SRGAN-wGR and SRGAN-woGR) on images with different degradations (clean, blur4, noise20), respectively. Then we treat each feature map as a one channel image and plot it. The visualized feature maps are shown in Fig. 10. We select 8 feature maps with the largest eigenvalues for display. The complete results are shown in the supplementary file.

**Influence of degradations on feature maps.** From Fig. 10(a), we can observe that the deep features obtained by SRResNet-woGR portray various characteristics of the input image, including edges, textures and contents. In particular, we highlight in “red rectangles” the features that retain most of the image content. As shown in Fig. 10(b), after applying blur and noise degradations to the input image, the
extracted features appear similar degradations as well. For blurred/noisy input images, the extracted feature maps also contain homologous blur/noise degradations.

**Effect of global residual.** In Sec. 5.1 we have revealed the importance and effectiveness of global residual (GR) for obtaining deep degradation representations for SR networks. But why GR is so important? What is the role of GR? Through visualization, we can provide a qualitative and intuitive explanation here. Comparing Fig. 10(a) and Fig. 10(b), it can be observed that by adopting GR, the extracted features seem to contain less components of original shape and content information. Thus, GR can help remove the redundant image content information and make the network concentrate more on obtaining features that are related to low-level degradation information.

**Effect of GAN.** Previously, we have discussed the difference between MSE-based and GAN-based SR methods in their deep representations. We find that GAN-based method can better obtain feature representations that are discriminative to different degradation types. As shown in Fig. 10(a) and Fig. 10(c), the feature maps extracted by GAN-based method contain less object shape and content information compared with MSE-based method. This partially explains why the deep representations of GAN-based method are more discriminative, even without global residual. Comparing Fig. 10(c) and Fig. 10(d), when there is global residual, the feature maps containing the image original content information are further reduced, leading to stronger discriminability to degradation types.

## 6. Inspirations and Future Work

Based on our discoveries, we draw significant inspirations on the future work. Due to the space limitation, more contents are shown in the supplementary file.

**Interpreting the Generalization of SR Networks.** In the previous sections, we have discussed the characteristics of DDR. Notably, the deep feature representations are obtained by super-resolution networks that are trained on clean dataset, i.e., the training data only contain downsampling degradation without blur or noise. What if we involve degraded data in the training process? To explore this question, we train a SRGAN-wGR model on noisy data (add Gaussian noise with $\sigma = 20$ on LR inputs). Then we compare the representation difference between models trained on clean data and noisy data. As presented in Fig. 11, we observe that by incorporating degraded data into training, the SR model is capable of simultaneously performing restoration and super-resolution. From the aspect of features, if the model is trained only on clean data, the obtained feature representations show strong discriminability to clean data and noisy data; but if the model is trained on noisy data, such discriminability disappears. It suggests that by incorporating more degraded data into training, the model becomes robust to handle more degradation types, and the distributions of the deep representations of different degraded data become unanimous with that of clean data. This can partially explain and evaluate the generalization ability of different models in feature level.
Figure 10. Visualization of feature maps. GR and GAN can facilitate the network to obtain more features on degradation information.

Figure 11. By incorporating more degraded data into training, the model becomes robust to handle more degradation types. Simultaneously, the distributions of the deep representations of different degraded data are more unanimous.

7. Conclusions

Can we find semantics in SR networks? Yes! In this paper, we have successfully discovered and interpreted the semantics of SR networks. Different from high-level vision networks, such semantics are highly related to the image degradation types and degrees. A series of observations and conclusions on the semantic representations in SR networks are drawn.
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Abstract

In this supplementary file, we provide more supporting materials. First, we introduce more background knowledge on the deep semantic representations of high-level and low-level vision networks. Then, we make a comparison between classification and super-resolution networks, in terms of problem formulations and network architectures. The experimental implementation details of the main paper are described as well. We also detail the numerical definitions of the adopted quantitative indicators (i.e., WD, BD and CHI). Further, for better comparison, we design a unified backbone framework to support and validate our findings in the main paper. There are also more discussions in this file.

1. Background

Since the emergence of deep convolutional neural network (CNN), a large number of computer vision tasks have been drastically promoted, including high-level vision tasks such as image classification [48, 56, 19, 23, 22], object localization [46, 18, 45] and semantic segmentation [37, 3, 6, 64], as well as low-level vision tasks such as image super-resolution [12, 32, 65, 74, 7], denoising [72, 73, 15, 44], dehazing [4, 71, 14, 9], etc. However, an interesting phenomenon is that even if we have successfully applied CNNs to many tasks, yet we still do not have a thorough understanding of its intrinsic working mechanism.

To better understand the behaviors of CNN, many efforts have been put in the neural network interpretability for high-level vision [55, 49, 69, 50, 41, 27, 39, 77, 1]. Most of them attempt to interpret the CNN decisions by visualization techniques, such as visualizing the intermediate feature maps (or saliency maps and class activation maps) [55, 69, 1, 78, 50], computing the class notion images which maximize the class score [55], or projecting feature representations [67, 66, 79, 24]. For high-level vision tasks, especially image classification, researchers have established a set of techniques for interpreting deep models and have built up a preliminary understanding of CNN behaviors [16]. One representative work is done by Zeiler et al. [69], who reveal the hierarchical nature of CNN by visualizing and interpreting the feature maps: the shallow layers respond to low-level features such as corners, curves and other edge/color conjunctions; the middle layers capture more complex texture combinations; the deeper layers are learned to encode more abstract and class-specific patterns, e.g., faces and legs. These patterns can be well interpreted by human perception and help partially explain the CNN decisions for high-level vision tasks.

As for low-level vision tasks, however, similar research work is absent. The possible reasons are as follows. In high-level vision tasks, there are usually artificially predefined semantic labels/categories. Thus, we can intuitively associate feature representations with these labels. Nevertheless, in low-level vision tasks, there is no explicit predefined semantics, making it hard to map the representations into a domain that the human can make sense of. Further, high-level vision usually performs classification in a discrete target domain with distinct categories, while low-level vision aims to solve a regression problem with continuous output values. Hence, without the guidance of predefined category semantics, it seems not so straightforward to interpret low-level vision networks.

In this paper, we take super-resolution (SR), one of the most representative tasks in low-level vision, as research object. Previously, it is generally thought that the features extracted from the SR network have no specific “semantic” information, and the network simply learns some complex
non-linear functions to model the relations between network input and output. Are CNN features SR networks really in lack of any semantics? Can we find any kind of “semantics” in SR networks? In this paper, we aim to give an answer to these questions. We reveal that there are semantics existing in SR networks. We first discover and interpret the “semantics” of deep representations in SR networks. But different from high-level vision networks, such semantics relate to the image degradation types and degrees. Accordingly, we designate the deep semantic representations in SR networks as deep degradation representations (DDR).

2. Classification vs. Super-resolution

2.1. Formulation

Classification. Classification aims to categorize an input image \( X \) into a discrete object class:

\[
\hat{Y} = G_{CL}(X),
\]

where \( G_{CL} \) represents the classification network, and \( \hat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^C \) is the predicted probability vector indicating which of the \( C \) categories \( X \) belongs to. In practice, cross-entropy loss is usually adopted to train the classification network:

\[
CE(Y, \hat{Y}) = - \sum_{i=1}^{C} y_i \log \hat{y}_i,
\]

where \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^C \) is a one-hot vector representing the ground-truth class label. \( \hat{y}_i \) is the \( i \)-th row element of \( \hat{Y} \), indicating the predicted probability that \( X \) belongs to the \( i \)-th class.

Super-resolution. A general image degradation process can be model as follows:

\[
X = (Y \otimes k) \downarrow_s + n,
\]

where \( Y \) is the high-resolution (HR) image and \( \otimes \) denotes the convolution operation. \( X \) is the degraded high-resolution (LR) image. There are three types of degradation in this model: blur kernel \( k \), downsampling operation \( \downarrow_s \) and additive noise \( n \). Hence, super-resolution can be regarded as a superset of other restoration tasks like denoising and deblurring.

Super-resolution (SR) is the inverse problem of Equ. (3). Given the input LR image \( X \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \), the super-resolution network attempts to produce its HR version:

\[
\hat{Y} = G_{SR}(X),
\]

where \( G_{SR} \) represents the super-resolution network, \( \hat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{sM \times sN} \) is the predicted HR image and \( s \) is the upscaling factor. This procedure can be regarded as a typical regression task. At present, there are two groups of method: MSE-based and GAN-based methods. The former one treats SR as a reconstruction problem, which utilizes pixel-wise loss such as \( L_2 \) loss to achieve high PSNR values.

\[
L_2(Y, \hat{Y}) = \frac{1}{r^2MN} \sum_{i=1}^{rN} \sum_{j=1}^{rM} \|Y_{i,j} - \hat{Y}_{i,j}\|^2_2.
\]

This is the most widely used loss function in many image restoration tasks [12, 36, 75, 73, 4, 17]. However, such loss tends to produce over-smoothed images. To generate photorealistic SR results, the latter method incorporates adversarial learning and perceptual loss to benefit better visual perception. The optimization is expressed as following min-max problem:

\[
\min_{\theta_{G_{SR}}} \max_{\theta_{D_{SR}}} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim PHR}[\log D_{SR}(Y)] + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim PLR}[\log(1 - D_{SR}(G_{SR}(X)))].
\]

From the formulation, we can clearly see that image classification and image super-resolution represent two typical tasks in machine learning: classification and regression. The output of the classification task is discrete, while the output of the regression task is continuous.

2.2. Architectures

Due to the different output types, the CNN architectures of classification and super-resolution networks also differ. Generally, classification networks often contain multiple downsampling layers (e.g., pooling and strided convolution) to gradually reduce the spatial resolution of feature maps. After several convolutional and downsampling layers, there may be one or more fully-connected layers to aggregate global semantic information and generate a vector containing \( C \) elements. For the output layer, the SoftMax operator is frequently used to normalize the previously obtained vector into a probabilistic representation. Some renowned classification network structures include AlexNet [30], VGG [56], ResNet [19], InceptionNet [58, 25, 57], DenseNet [23], SENet[3], etc.

Unlike classification networks, super-resolution networks usually do not rely on downsampling layers, but up-sampling layers (e.g., bilinear upsampling, transposed convolution [70] or subpixel convolution [54]). Thus, the spatial resolution of feature maps would increase. Another difference is that the output of the SR network is a three-channel image, rather than an abstract probability vector. The well-known SR network structures include SRCNN [12], FSRCNN [13], SRRResNet [32], RDN [76], RCAN
An intuitive comparison of classification and SR networks in CNN architecture is shown in Fig. 6. We can notice that one is gradually downsampling, and the other is gradually upsampling, which displays the discrepancy between high-level vision and low-level vision tasks in structure designing.

Although there are several important architectural differences, classification networks and SR networks can share and adopt some proven effective building modules, like skip connection [19, 36] and attention mechanism [22, 75].

3. Implementation Details

In the main paper, we conduct experiments on ResNet18 [19] and SRResNet/SRGAN [32]. We elaborate more details on the network structures and training settings here.

For ResNet18, we directly adopt the network structure depicted in [19]. Cross-entropy loss (Eq. 2) is used as the loss function. The learning rate is initialized to 0.1 and decreased with a cosine annealing strategy. We apply SGD optimizer with weight decay $5 \times 10^{-4}$. The trained model yields an accuracy of 92.86% on CIFAR10 testing set which consists of 10,000 images.

For SRResNet-wGR/SRResNet_woGR, we stack 16 residual blocks (RB) as shown in Fig. 3 of the main paper. The residual block is the same as depicted in [65], in which all the BN layers are removed. Two Pixel-shuffle layers [54] are utilized to conduct upsampling in the network, while the global residual branch is upsampled by bilinear interpolation. $L_1$ loss is adopted as the loss function. The learning rate is initialized to $2 \times 10^{-4}$ and is halved at [100k, 300k, 500k, 600k] iterations. A total of 600,000 iterations are executed.

For SRGAN-wGR/SRGAN_woGR, the generator is the same as SRResNet-wGR/SRResNet-wGR. The discriminator is designed as in [32]. Adversarial loss (Eq. 7) and perceptual loss [26] are combined as the loss functions, which are kept the same as in [32]. The learning rate of both generator and discriminator is initialized to $1 \times 10^{-4}$ and is halved at [50k, 100k, 200k, 300k] iterations. A total of 600,000 iterations are executed. For all the super-resolution networks, we apply Adam optimizer [29] with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.99$. All the training LR patches are of size $128 \times 128$. When testing, 32 × 32 patches are fed into the networks to obtain deep features. In practice, we find that the patch size has little effect on revealing the deep degradation representations.

All above models are trained on PyTorch platform with GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs.

4. Definitions of WD, BD and CHI

In Sec. 3.1 of the main paper, we describe the adopted analysis method on deep feature representations. Many other literatures also have adopted similar approaches to interpret and visualize the deep models, such as Graph Attention Network [63], Recurrent Networks [27], Deep Q-Network [68] and Neural Models in NLP [35]. Most aforementioned researches adopt t-SNE as a qualitative analysis technique. To better illustrate and quantitatively measure the semantic discriminability of deep feature representations, we take a step further and introduce several indicators, which are originally used to evaluate the clustering performance, according to the data structure after dimensionality reduction by t-SNE. Specifically, we propose to adopt within-cluster dispersion (WD), between-clusters dispersion (BD) and Calinski-Harabaz Index (CHI) [5] to provide some rough yet practicable quantitative measures for reference. For $K$ clusters, WD, BD and CHI are defined as:

$$ WD(K) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n(k)} \| x_{i} - \bar{x}_k \|^2 , \quad (8) $$

where $x_{i}$ represents the $i$-th datapoint belonging to class $k$ and $\bar{x}_k$ is the average mean of all $n(k)$ datapoints that belong to class $k$. Datapoints belonging to the same class should be close enough to each other and WD measures the compactness within a cluster.

$$ BD(K) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} n(k) \| \bar{x}_k - \bar{x} \|^2 , \quad (9) $$

where $\bar{x}$ represents the average mean of all datapoints. BD measures the distance between clusters. Intuitively, larger BD value indicates stronger discriminability between different feature clusters. Given $K$ clusters and $N$ datapoints in total ($N = \sum_k n(k)$), by combining WD and BD, the CHI is formulated as:

$$ CHI(K) = \frac{BD(K)}{WD(K)} \cdot \frac{(N - K)}{(K - 1)} . \quad (10) $$

It is represented as the ratio of the between-clusters dispersion mean and the within-cluster dispersion. The CHI score is higher when clusters are dense and well separated, which relates to a standard concept of a cluster.

5. Understanding and Evaluating Deep Feature Representations

In this section, we adopt quantitative indicators to help evaluate the deep representations. From Fig. 1, it can be observed that as the network deepens, the extracted feature representations produce obvious clusters, i.e., the learned features are increasingly becoming semantically discriminative. Further, such discriminative semantics are coherent with the artificially predefined labels (semantic categories). This is an intuitive and natural observation on which lots of representation and discriminative learning methods were
Figure 1. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of ResNet18 using t-SNE. With the network deepens, the representations become more discriminative to object categories, which clearly shows the semantics of the representations in classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Layer</th>
<th>Conv1</th>
<th>Conv2,4</th>
<th>Conv3,4</th>
<th>Conv4,4</th>
<th>Conv5,4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dim</td>
<td>64×32×32</td>
<td>64×32×32</td>
<td>128×16×16</td>
<td>256×8×8</td>
<td>512×4×4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>4.07 ± 0.43</td>
<td>3.41 ± 0.31</td>
<td>3.32 ± 0.31</td>
<td>2.06 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1.04 ± 0.13</td>
<td>1.22 ± 0.11</td>
<td>1.84 ± 0.40</td>
<td>5.77 ± 0.23</td>
<td>10.74 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>28.18 ± 1.69</td>
<td>39.22 ± 1.44</td>
<td>61.12 ± 13.62</td>
<td>309.31 ± 31.10</td>
<td>1688.62 ± 145.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Quantitative measures for the discriminability of the projected deep feature representations. We statistically report the mean value and the standard deviation of each metric. The adopted indicators well reflect the effect of feature clustering quantitatively.

Based [67, 43, 34, 66]. Note that the class labels in the scatterplots are only used to assign a color/symbol to the data-points for better visualization. The class information is not used by t-SNE to determine the spatial coordinates of the data after dimension reduction.

Since the class label of each datapoint is available, we can calculate the WD, BD and CHI scores for each projected map derived from t-SNE. The results are summarized in Tab. 1. It is remarkable that by introducing these indices, we can now quantitatively assess the semantic discriminability of feature representations. Combing Fig. 1 and Tab. 1, it is observed that the quantitative results are consistent with the previous qualitative analysis. With the increase of network depth, the feature representations are more semantically discriminative, coinciding with predefined class labels.

In the main paper, we mainly report the CHI scores. Here we provide the complete quantitative results in Tab. 1, Tab. 2 and Tab. 3. It can be observed that the qualitative visualization results (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) are in accordance with the quantitative results. By introducing the quantitative measures, we now can better evaluate the semantic discriminability of deep feature representations.

Rationality of Using Quantitative Measures with t-SNE. Notably, t-SNE is not a numerical technique but a probabilistic one. It minimizes the Kullback-Leibler (K-L) divergence between the distributions that measure pairwise similarities of the input high-dimensional data and that of the corresponding low-dimensional points in the embedding. Further, t-SNE is a non-convex optimization process which is performed using a gradient descent method, as a result of which several optimization parameters need to be chosen, like perplexity, iterations and learning rate. Hence, the reconstruction solutions may differ due to the choice of different optimization parameters and the initial random states. In this paper, we used exactly the same optimization procedure for all experiments. Moreover, we conduct extensive experiments using different parameters and demonstrate that the quality of the optima does not vary much from run to run, which is also emphasized in the t-SNE paper. To make the quantitative analysis more statistically solid, for each projection process, we run t-SNE five times and report the average and standard deviations of every metric.

6. Visualization of Feature Maps

In the main paper, we have displayed the feature maps of each SR network to make a qualitative interpretation about the formation of deep degradation representations. However, due to space limitation, we only display 8 feature maps with the largest eigenvalues. Since there are 64 channels in the “ResBlock16” layer, we here provide the complete 64 feature maps of each input, as shown in Fig. 4. The visualization results reveal that global residual (GR) and adversarial learning (GAN) can facilitate the network to concentrate more on the degradation information instead of image content information. For the same degradation type, the extracted feature maps are close to each other, while the feature maps of different degradation types are very different.

7. Exploration of Network Structure

In the main paper, we choose ResNet18 [19] and SRResNet/SRGAN [32] as the backbones of classification and SR networks, respectively. In order to eliminate the influence of different network structures, we design a unified backbone framework, which is composed of the same basic building modules but connected with different tails for downsampling and upsampling to conduct classification and super-
Figure 2. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of SRRResNet-woGR (1st row) and SRRResNet-wGR (2nd row) using t-SNE. With image global residual (GR), the representations of MSE-based SR networks show discriminability to degradation types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Layer</th>
<th>Conv1</th>
<th>ResBlock4</th>
<th>ResBlock8</th>
<th>ResBlock16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WD\textunderscore j(×10^4)</td>
<td>8.35 ± 0.14</td>
<td>8.90 ± 0.22</td>
<td>9.28 ± 0.31</td>
<td>4.98 ± 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD↑</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.14</td>
<td>1.98 ± 1.47</td>
<td>25.60 ± 17.73</td>
<td>1149.20 ± 765.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI↑</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.03</td>
<td>3.55 ± 2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Quantitative measures for the projected deep feature representations obtained by SRRResNet-woGR and SRRResNet-wGR.

Figure 3. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of SRGAN-woGR (1st row) and SRGAN-wGR (2nd row) using t-SNE. Even without GR, GAN-based SR networks can still obtain deep degradation representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Layer</th>
<th>Conv1</th>
<th>ResBlock4</th>
<th>ResBlock8</th>
<th>ResBlock16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WD\textunderscore j(×10^4)</td>
<td>7.94 ± 0.20</td>
<td>7.83 ± 0.33</td>
<td>4.65 ± 0.58</td>
<td>1.44 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD↑</td>
<td>0.58 ± 0.41</td>
<td>4.79 ± 2.43</td>
<td>9809.00 ± 4501.19</td>
<td>22459.35 ± 3500.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI↑</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.00</td>
<td>34.00 ± 22.00</td>
<td>234.43 ± 30.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Quantitative measures for the projected deep feature representations obtained by SRGAN-woGR and SRGAN-wGR.
Figure 4. Visualization of feature maps. GR and GAN can facilitate the network to obtain more features on degradation information.
Figure 5. Projected feature representations extracted from different layers of unified backbone framework (classification) using t-SNE. The results are similar to ResNet18, which validates that the deep semantic representations are uncorrelated with network structures but are associated with the task itself.

Table 4. Quantitative measures for the discriminability of the projected deep feature representations obtained by unified backbone framework (classification).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Layer</th>
<th>Conv1</th>
<th>Down1</th>
<th>Down2</th>
<th>Down3</th>
<th>Down4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dim</td>
<td>64×32×32</td>
<td>64×32×32</td>
<td>128×16×16</td>
<td>256×8×8</td>
<td>512×4×4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD ↓ (×10^3)</td>
<td>3.64 ± 0.33</td>
<td>2.76 ± 0.27</td>
<td>2.52 ± 0.19</td>
<td>1.83 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD ↑ (×10^3)</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.97 ± 0.18</td>
<td>1.60 ± 0.19</td>
<td>3.84 ± 0.40</td>
<td>7.48 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI ↑</td>
<td>33.11 ± 1.38</td>
<td>39.53 ± 9.98</td>
<td>70.11 ± 9.94</td>
<td>230.95 ± 22.63</td>
<td>1403.96 ± 27.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Unified backbone framework for classification and super-resolution. The two networks share the same backbone structure and different tails. We adopt channel attention module as the basic building block in the backbone. ⊗ denotes element-wise multiplication.

The unified architecture is shown in Fig. 6. To differ from the residual block in the main paper, we adopt residual channel attention layer as basic building block, which is inspired by SENet [22] and RCAN [75]. For classification, the network tail consists of three maxpooling layers and a fully connected layer; for super-resolution, the network tail consists of two pixel-shuffle layers to upsample the feature maps. According to the conclusions in the main paper, we adopt global residual (GR) in the network design to obtain deep degradation representations (DDR). Except the network structure, all the training protocols are kept the same as in the main paper. The training details are the same as in the main paper. The training details are the same as in the main paper. The training details are the same as in the main paper.

Figure 7. Projected feature representations extracted from unified backbone framework (super-resolution) using t-SNE.

as depicted in Sec. 3. After training, the unified backbone framework for classification yields an accuracy of 92.08% on CIFAR10 testing set.

The experimental results are shown in Fig. 5, Fig. 7 and Tab. 4. From the results, we can see that the observations are consistent with the findings in the main paper. It suggests that the semantic representations do not stem from network structures, but from the task itself. Hence, our findings are not only limited to specific structures but are universal.

8. Discussions on Dimensionality Reduction

Among the numerous dimensionality reduction techniques (e.g., PCA [21], CCA [8], LLE [47], Isomap[59], SNE[20]), t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) [62] is a widely-used and effective algorithm. It can
greatly capture the local structure of the high-dimensional data and simultaneously reveal global structure such as the presence of clusters at several scales. Following [11, 40, 67, 68, 63, 66, 24], we also take advantage of the superior manifold learning capability of t-SNE for feature projection and visualization.

In this section we further explain the effectiveness of adopting t-SNE and why we choose to project high-dimensional features into two-dimensional datapoints. We first compare the projection results of PCA and t-SNE. From the results shown in Fig. 8, it can be observed that the projected features by t-SNE are successfully clustered together according the semantic labels, while the projected features by PCA are not well separated. It is because that PCA is a linear dimension reduction method which cannot deal with complex non-linear data obtained by the neural networks. Thus, t-SNE is a better choice to conduct dimension reduction on CNN features. This suggests the effectiveness of t-SNE for the purpose of feature projection. Note that we do not claim t-SNE is the optimal or the best choice for dimensionality reduction. We just utilize t-SNE as a rational tool to show the trend behind deep representations, since t-SNE has been proven effective and practical in our experiments and other literatures.

Then, we discuss the dimensions to reduce. We conduct dimensionality reduction to different dimensions. Since the highest dimension supported by t-SNE is 3, we first compare the effect between the two-dimensional projected features and the three-dimensional projected features by t-SNE. The qualitative and quantitative results are shown in Fig. 8 and Tab. 5. When we reduce the features to three dimensions, the reduced representations also show discriminability to semantic labels. However, quantitative results show that two dimensions can better portray the discriminability than three or higher dimensions. For PCA, the results are similar. With higher dimensions, the discriminability decrease. Hence, it is reasonable to reduce high-dimensional features into two-dimensional datapoints. Such settings are also adopted in [11, 66, 63, 24], which are proven effective.

### 9. Samples of Different Datasets

In the main paper, we adopt several different datasets to conduct experiments. Fig. 9 displays some example images from these datasets.

(a) DIV2K-clean: the original DIV2K [2] dataset. The high-resolution (HR) ground-truth (GT) images have 2K resolution and are of high visual quality. The low-resolution (LR) input images are downsampled from HR by bicubic interpolation, without any further degradations.

(b) DIV2K-noise: adding Gaussian noises to DIV2K-clean LR input, thus making it contain extra noise degradation. DIV2K-noise20 means the additive Gaussian noise level $\sigma$ is 20, where the number denotes the noise level.

(c) DIV2K-blur: applying Gaussian blur to DIV2K-clean LR input, thus making it contain extra blur degradation. DIV2K-blur4 means the Gaussian blur width is 4.

(d) DIV2K-mild: officially synthesized from DIV2K [2] dataset as challenge dataset [60, 61], which contains noise, blur, pixel shifting and other degradations. The degradation modelling is unknown to challenge participants.

(e) Hollywood100: 100 images selected from Holly-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Layer</th>
<th>Conv5_4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input #Dim</td>
<td>512 × 4 × 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>PCA(50)+t-SNE(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced #Dim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD ↓ ($\times 10^2$)</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD ↑ ($\times 10^2$)</td>
<td>10.74 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI ↑</td>
<td>1688.62 ± 145.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Quantitative comparison with dimensionality reduction methods and reduced dimensions. To utilize t-SNE, we first use PCA to pre-reduce the features to 50 dimensions. Since PCA is a numerical method, the result is fixed. For t-SNE, we report the mean and standard deviation for 5 runs. The quantitative results show that t-SNE surpasses PCA and reducing to two dimensions is better. The features are obtained by “Conv5_4” layer of ResNet18.

Figure 8. Comparison between PCA and t-SNE for projecting feature representations (“Conv5_4” layer of ResNet18).
wood dataset [31], containing real-world old film frames with unknown degradations, which may have compression, noise, blur and other real-world degradations. Dataset (a), (b), (c) and (d) have the same image contents but different degradations. However, we find that the deep degradation representations (DDR) obtained by SR networks have discriminability to these degradation types, even if the network has not seen these degradations at all during training. Further, for real-world degradation like in (e), the DDR are still able to discern it.

10. Inspirations and Future Work

10.1. Developing Degradation-adaptive Algorithms

One big challenge for image restoration is that there are myriad real-world and complicated cases with various degradation types and degrees. Thus, it is non-trivial to design a robust algorithm that can successfully handle all circumstances. One key to solve this problem is to make the algorithm be degradation-adaptive, so that it can specifically deal with different degradations.

In this paper, we have discovered the deep degradation representations in super-resolution networks, which are discriminative to different degradation types and degrees. This naturally provides the insight to solve the problem of blind restoration, where the profile of the degradation modeling is unknown and inaccessible. Concretely, we can leverage the deep degradation representations as prior knowledge to guide the subsequent modules to perform degradation-aware and degradation-adaptive processes.

10.2. Disentanglement of Image Content and Degradation

In plenty of image editing and synthesizing tasks, researchers seek to disentangle an image through different attributes, so that the image can be finely edited [28, 38, 10, 33, 42]. For example, semantic face editing [51, 52, 53] aims at manipulating facial attributes of a given image, e.g., pose, gender, age, smile, etc. Most methods attempt to learn disentangled representations and to control the facial attributes by manipulating the latent space. In low-level vision, the deep degradation representations can make it possible to decompose an image into content and degradation information, which can promote a number of new areas, such as degradation transferring and degradation editing. Further, more in-depth research on deep degradation representations will also greatly improve our understanding of the nature of images.
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Figure 9. Example images from different datasets. (a) DIV2K-clean. (b) DIV2K-noise20. (c) DIV2K-blur4. (d) DIV2K-mild. (e) Hollywood100. Different datasets contain different degradation types. (a), (b), (c) and (d) are aligned with image content, but contains degradations. The deep degradation representations (DDR) are discriminative to various degradations.


