

Implicit Neural Representation for Videos Based on Residual Connection

Taiga Hayami Hiroshi Watanabe

Graduate School of Fundamental Science and Engineering, Waseda University
Tokyo, Japan

hayatai17@fuji.waseda.jp hiroshi.watanabe@waseda.jp

Abstract—Video compression technology is essential for transmitting and storing videos. Many video compression methods reduce information in videos by removing high-frequency components and utilizing similarities between frames. Alternatively, the implicit neural representations (INRs) for videos, which use networks to represent and compress videos through model compression. A conventional method improves the quality of reconstruction by using frame features. However, the detailed representation of the frames can be improved. To improve the quality of reconstructed frames, we propose a method that uses low-resolution frames as residual connection that is considered effective for image reconstruction. Experimental results show that our method outperforms the existing method, HNeRV, in PSNR for 46 of the 49 videos.

Index Terms—Video compression, implicit neural representations, residual connection, NeRV, HNeRV

I. INTRODUCTION

Video compression methods reduce the size of the video by removing redundant information while maintaining frame quality. With the increase in high-resolution video due to advances in technology, the need for high-performance video compression methods is increasing. Recently, compression methods using implicit neural representations (INRs) have gained attention. INRs employ neural networks to represent signals like images, scenes, and audio, making it highly versatile for various types of signals. INRs for videos, such as NeRV [1], represent videos with neural networks. There are two main types of INRs for videos, index-based and hybrid-based methods. Index-based methods provide time t as a frame index to the network, while hybrid-based methods provide frame features. The hybrid-based method, HNeRV [2], represents a video as a network that generates frames from frame features extracted by an encoder. However, the fine details of the frame are not adequately represented.

In this paper, we propose implicit neural representation of videos using residual connection. By employing low-resolution frames as residual connections, the high-frequency components of the frames are made easier to learn.

II. RELATED WORKS

A. NeRV

NeRV [1] is one of the index-based methods. This method represents a video as a network that generates t -frame from time t , as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Specifically, a video is




Fig. 1: The pipeline. (a) NeRV. (b) HNeRV. (c) Ours.

represented by a function $f_\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ that outputs a frame from frame index t . Video compression is achieved through model compression of the network such as pruning and quantization.

B. HNeRV

NeRV reconstructs the frames from only frame indexes. The quality of frame reconstruction is limited by poor input dimensionality and diversity. To enhance the expressiveness of the input, HNeRV [2] employs frame features instead of frame indexes. The structure of HNeRV is an auto-encoder, which is a hybrid-based method, as shown in Fig. 1 (b). An encoder is included to extract frame features. In HNeRV, the video is represented by the features corresponding to each frame along with a single decoder. Video compression is achieved by feature compression and model compression of the decoder network.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

In HNeRV, an encoder extracts features from frames. However, the size of these features is quite small and insufficient for reconstructing the frames. The decoder that generates frames from these features can capture the basic structure of the video but have difficulty with finer details. To address this, a residual connection [3] to low-resolution frames is used, which helps the decoder focus on detailed representation. The pipeline of the proposed method is shown in Fig. 1 (c). Specifically, a low-resolution frame y_{resize} is obtained by reducing the size of frame y with a resizing scale n . The low-resolution frame y_{resize} is resized back to its original size using the

TABLE I: Comparison of reconstructed videos by PSNR \uparrow

Method	bear	b-flare	c-shadow	d-agility	elephant	h-high	lucia	motorbike	rollerblade	stroller	train	ave.
HNeRV	26.81	29.50	33.39	32.57	30.94	31.03	29.05	31.95	35.24	32.76	30.13	31.28
Ours	27.06	29.59	34.31	33.55	31.23	31.28	29.10	32.93	35.72	33.10	30.30	31.68

TABLE II: Comparison of reconstructed videos by MS-SSIM \uparrow

Method	bear	b-flare	c-shadow	d-agility	elephant	h-high	lucia	motorbike	rollerblade	stroller	train	ave.
HNeRV	0.8632	0.8776	0.9568	0.9562	0.9112	0.9341	0.9018	0.9305	0.9668	0.9354	0.9255	0.9236
Ours	0.8691	0.8801	0.9624	0.9640	0.9166	0.9333	0.9008	0.9412	0.9690	0.9394	0.9265	0.9280




Fig. 2: Visualization of reconstructed videos.

bicubic method and the resulting frame y_{LR} is obtained. The reconstructed frame \tilde{y} is generated by y_{LR} and the decoder output. The pipeline is represented as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{resize} &= \text{Resize}(y, (y_h/n, y_w/n)), \\
 y_{LR} &= \text{Interpolate}(y_{resize}, (y_h, y_w)), \\
 \tilde{y} &= y_{LR} + f_{\theta}(y),
 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where f_{θ} is encoder and decoder. y_h and y_w are frame height and width. T frames of video are represented by T features, T low-resolution frames, and a decoder. The total size of the video representation increases by y_{resize} compared to HNeRV. When the bit depth of frame is 8 bits, the increase in bits per pixel (bpp) by y_{resize} is expressed as follows,

$$\text{bpp}_{y_{resize}} = \frac{3 \times 8}{n \times n}. \quad (2)$$

We use feature quantization and model quantization to the decoder parameters as video compression.

IV. EXPERIMENT

We use videos from the DAVIS [4] dataset except for the 'motocross-jump' video because HNeRV can not sufficiently represent this video. DAVIS dataset has 49 videos with size 1080×1920 , 25-104 frames. Frame size is cropped to 640×1280 . The resize scale is $n = 128$. Bitrate increase by 1.46×10^{-3} compared to HNeRV. The feature quantization factor is 6 and the model quantization factor is 8. The learning rate is 9.9×10^{-4} for the proposed method and 1×10^{-3} for HNeRV. The base model size is 1.5. For the evaluation metrics, we used PSNR and MS-SSIM.




Fig. 3: Video compression results on DAVIS dataset.

The evaluation results of the video reconstruction for HNeRV and our method are shown in Table I and II. In each table we show results of 11 videos and the average of 49 videos. Our method outperforms HNeRV in PSNR and MS-SSIM for 46 and 39 of 49 videos, respectively. Since the network learns residuals, the appropriate resize scale and learning rate need to be selected based on the size of the residuals. Examples of video reconstruction visualization are shown in Fig. 2. In 'parkour' video, the arm in the frame is blurred in HNeRV, while the proposed method is able to represent it. In 'bmx-bumps' video, the text in the frame is clearly represented. The results of the video compression are shown in Fig. 3. We change the model size to 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0. The proposed method can achieve improved quality with a small additional bit rate.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a novel implicit neural representation for video using residual connection. By adding low-resolution frames as residual connection to the network, detailed expression can be improved. Experimental results show that our method exceeded HNeRV. In the future, we need to consider how to properly select resize scale and learning rate.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Chen *et al.*, "NeRV: Neural Representations for Videos," Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 21557-21568, Nov. 2021.
- [2] H. Chen *et al.*, "HNeRV: A Hybrid Neural Representation for Videos," IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 10270-10279, Jun. 2023.
- [3] K. He *et al.*, "Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition," IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 770-778, Jun. 2016.
- [4] F. Parazzi *et al.*, "A Benchmark Dataset and Evaluation Methodology for Video Object Segmentation," IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 724-732, Jun. 2016.