

COMPETITIVE LEARNING FOR ACHIEVING CONTENT-SPECIFIC FILTERS IN VIDEO CODING FOR MACHINES

Honglei Zhang, Jukka I. Ahonen, Nam Le, Ruiying Yang, Francesco Cricri

Nokia Technologies, Finland

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the efficacy of jointly optimizing content-specific post-processing filters to adapt a human-oriented video/image codec into a codec suitable for machine vision tasks. By observing that artifacts produced by video/image codecs are content-dependent, we propose a novel training strategy based on competitive learning principles. This strategy assigns training samples to filters dynamically, in a fuzzy manner, which further optimizes the winning filter on the given sample. Inspired by simulated annealing optimization techniques, we employ a softmax function with a temperature variable as the weight allocation function to mitigate the effects of random initialization. Our evaluation, conducted on a system utilizing multiple post-processing filters within a Versatile Video Coding (VVC) codec framework, demonstrates the superiority of content-specific filters trained with our proposed strategies, specifically, when images are processed in blocks. Using VVC reference software VTM 12.0 as the anchor, experiments on the OpenImages dataset show an improvement in the BD-rate reduction from -41.3% and -44.6% to -42.3% and -44.7% for object detection and instance segmentation tasks, respectively, compared to independently trained filters. The statistics of the filter usage align with our hypothesis and underscore the importance of jointly optimizing filters for both content and reconstruction quality. Our findings pave the way for further improving the performance of video/image codecs.

Index Terms— video coding for machines, post-processing filter, VCM, competitive learning

1. INTRODUCTION

Video and image compression has been one of the most important technologies for the industry with broad applications [1, 2]. Recent advances in deep learning technologies have greatly boosted the importance of video coding for machines (VCM), where the reconstructed videos/images are consumed by machines to perform vision tasks such as object detection, instance segmentation, and object tracking [3, 4, 5]. Among many other technologies proposed for VCM, previous research has shown that post-processing filter can significantly improve the performance of conventional codecs, which are




Fig. 1. A VCM system with a conventional codec and multiple post-processing filters

optimized for human beings, when used for machine tasks [6, 7]. Figure 1 shows a VCM codec with a conventional video/image codec enhanced by multiple post-processing filters for machine tasks.

A video/image codec compresses an input video/image at various compression ratios to generate reconstructed videos/images with different qualities [8, 9]. Higher quality reconstructed data is generated with lower compression ratios, i.e., higher bit rate, and vice versa. In conventional video/image codecs, the compression ratio is normally controlled by a quantization parameter (QP). It is well known that different compression ratios may generate different compression artifacts. For example, blurring and blocking artifacts are more visible in low-quality reconstructions [10]. To adapt different artifacts in the reconstructed data generated with different compression ratios, a quality indicator variable, e.g., the QP value, may be given as an input to a post-processing filter [11] as an indication of the type of the artifacts. A post-processing filter is typically trained using the reconstructed data of varying qualities along with the corresponding quality indicator as inputs, providing additional information to enable the filter to adapt to the input quality more effectively. In an alternative approach, more than one post-processing filters are trained and each post-processing filter is targeted to the reconstructed data of a predefined quality range. At the inference stage, when processing input data, the decoder selects the post-processing filter that has been trained with the quality range encompassing the quality of the sample [12, 13]. This approach improves the performance of the system without increasing the computational complexity at the inference time compared to the one-filter approach.

However, it is observed that the compression artifacts are not only dependent on the compression ratio, e.g., QP values.

More importantly, the content of the input data also greatly impacts the artifacts. For example, the size and strength of blocking artifacts may differ significantly in homogeneous and heterogeneous regions due to the difference in the coding unit sizes. In another example, ringing artifacts may only appear in regions with regular patterns. For VCM, to improve task performance, a post-processing filter may perform different operations on different regions, depending on the content of the regions. For example, a post-processing filter may smooth the background regions such as sky and grass regions, to reduce false detection, and enhance edges and patterns in object regions. Training multiple post-processing filters to adapt the content of the input data requires dividing the training data into different categories and assigning samples in each category to a post-processing filter. However, defining the categories would require prior knowledge, which is normally a difficult task. To address these difficulties, we propose a joint training strategy inspired by competitive learning to train multiple content-dependent post-processing filters simultaneously. We evaluated the proposed training strategy on a video codec for VCM with a conventional video codec enhanced by post-processing filters.

2. METHODS

2.1. Problems

Post-processing filter is an efficient technology to improve the quality of the reconstructed video for a conventional video/image codec, such as VVC and HEVC [11, 12, 13, 14]. A post-processing filter is normally trained by minimizing a loss function, defined by

$$L = \mathbb{E}_x D(F(\hat{x}|w), x), \quad (1)$$

where x is uncompressed data, \hat{x} is the reconstructed data output by the conventional codec, w is the learnable parameters of the post-processing filter, $F(\cdot|w)$ is the output of the post-processing filter, $D(\cdot)$ is a distortion measurement and $\mathbb{E}_x(\cdot)$ is the expected value given random variable x . The distortion measurement may be mean squared error (MSE), structural similarity index measure (SSIM) [15] or alike for human consumption. In the case of video/image codec for machines, proxy loss, e.g., MSE loss of the feature maps obtained from a proxy network from uncompressed data and the output of the post-processing filter, may be used as the distortion measurement [6, 16]. A proxy network is normally the backbone of a pretrained neural network model for a typical computer vision task, such as instance segmentation.

To obtain multiple post-processing filters with each filter dedicated to a specific content, the parameters of the post-processing filters can be derived by optimizing the loss function

$$L = \mathbb{E}_x \min_{j=1}^M (D(F(\hat{x}|w_j), x)), \quad (2)$$

where M is the number of post-processing filters, w_j for $j = 1, \dots, M$ is the learnable parameters of the j -th filter. The M post-processing filters can be derived by minimizing Eq. 2 with respect to w_1, w_2, \dots, w_M . However, minimizing Eq. 2 directly is difficult due to the nonlinear nature of the filters and the minimization function. The training is highly sensitive to the initialization values of the learnable parameters.

Note that our target is to assign training samples to post-processing filters such that similar samples are assigned to the same filter. Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is normally applied to train post-processing filters, which are deep convolutional neural networks. Filters are optimized at each iteration step, resulting in better performance, for the samples in a training batch. By minimizing Eq. 2, the filter with the minimal distortion measurement for a sample gets improved for that sample in one training iteration. As the parameters of the multiple post-processing filters are randomly initialized, the sample assignment to the filters is also random, thus resulting in inefficient training.

To alleviate the training difficulties, we replace the minimization function in Eq. 2 by a linear function to derive a relaxation of the loss as

$$L = \mathbb{E}_x \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \alpha_j(\hat{x}) D(F(\hat{x}|w_j), x) \right), \quad (3)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \alpha_j(\hat{x}) = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_j(\hat{x}) \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_j(\hat{x})$ is the weight for the j -th filter for reconstructed data \hat{x} . When $\alpha(\hat{x}) = [\alpha_1(\hat{x}), \dots, \alpha_M(\hat{x})]^T$ is a one-hot vector, i.e., one element in the vector has the value of 1 and all other elements are zeros, minimizing Eq. 3 is equivalent to minimizing the distortion loss of the filter with the weight of one, i.e., assigning the sample \hat{x} to the selected filter. The optimization of Eq. 3 is an approximation of assigning each sample to the filters during the optimization process through a weighting strategy.

2.2. Competitive learning and annealing

Following the principle of competitive learning [17, 18], we design a training strategy where the filters compete with each other for the right to process a sample. The filter that obtains a lower distortion measurement is assigned a higher weight in Eq. 3, resulting in better performance for that sample after the optimization step. Let $l_j = D(F(\hat{x}|w_j), x)$ be the distortion measurement of filter j for reconstructed data \hat{x} . Inspired by the simulated annealing method [19], we set

$$\alpha_j(\hat{x}) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{l_j}{T}\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{l_k}{T}\right)}, \quad (5)$$

where T is the temperature variable that controls “hardness” of the assignment. Note that Eq. 5 is a softmax function with temperature T . When $T \rightarrow \infty$, $\alpha_j \rightarrow \frac{1}{M}$, indicating the same weight for all filters. When $T \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha(\hat{x})$ is close to a one-hot vector, indicating assigning all weights to the winning filter. Given a dataset with N training samples (x_i, \hat{x}_i) for $i = 1, \dots, N$, the objective function for the dataset is

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \alpha_j(\hat{x}_i) D(F(\hat{x}_i|w_j), x_i) \quad (6)$$

During the training, we gradually reduce temperature T from the initial temperature T_0 . For simplicity, we choose a staircase function as the cooling schedule for the temperature variable T . The cooling function is defined as

$$T = T_0 \beta^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{K} \rfloor}, \quad (7)$$

where k is the epoch number, K is the drop step, β is the base scale factor, and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is floor function. According to the annealing function defined by Eq. 7, the temperature T drops β times every K epochs. T_0 , K and β are hyperparameters of the training.

2.3. Filter architecture

The architecture of the post-processing filter used in our experiments incorporates an autoencoder backbone with lateral connections. The detailed architecture is shown in Figure 2, where \hat{x} is reconstructed video from a conventional video/image codec, $F(\hat{x}|w)$ is the output of the filter given learnable parameters w , q is an indicator vector for the QP value of the reconstructed data. Notation $k \times k, C_1, C_2$ indicates a 2D convolution with kernel size k , input channel size C_1 and output channel size C_2 . $\downarrow 2$ indicates a convolution operation with stride 2, which performs the down-sampling operation, and $\uparrow 2$ indicates a transposed convolution operation with stride 2, which performs the up-sampling operation. “ResBlocks,3” represents a sequence of 3 residual blocks [20], and “Cat” in a circle represents a concatenation operation that concatenates input tensors along channel dimension.

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Main results

In our experiments, post-processing filters are applied to the reconstructed data from a VVC codec [8] to improve the performance for machine tasks [6]. The system architecture is shown in Figure 1.

To demonstrate the performance of the proposed method, named as *joint-filters*, we compare the multiple post-processing filters trained using the proposed training strategy with two baseline methods. With the first baseline method, named as *one-filter*, a post-processing filter was trained on the data

of various qualities. The filter has the same network architecture as the one illustrated in Figure 2. The QP value of reconstructed data is also given as an input to the filter. With the second baseline method, named as *independent-filters*, multiple post-processing filters were trained independently and each post-processing filter was trained on a range of QP values. At the inference time, each reconstructed data is assigned to the filter trained with the range of the QP values that includes the QP value of the reconstructed data. We evaluate the filters trained with the proposed method and the competing methods on object detection and instance segmentation tasks on the OpenImages dataset [21] following the evaluation procedure defined by the MPEG VCM standardization working group [22].

The video/image codec used in the experiments is VTM 12.0 and the input images are compressed using 7 QP values: 22, 27, 32, 37, 42, 47, and 52. 30k training images were randomly selected from the training split of the OpenImages V6 [21]. Each of the test sets for the object detection and instance segmentation tasks contains 5k images. The machine tasks are evaluated using the mean Average Precision scores (mAP). The compression performance of a codec is measured using Bjontegaard delta bit rate (BD-rate) scores [22], which quantitatively measure the difference between the rate-distortion (RD) curve of a test codec with the RD curve of an anchor codec. In our experiments, the anchor codec is VTM 12.0 without a post-processing filter. With the *one-filter* baseline, the post-processing filter was trained with all training data for 150 epochs. With the *independent-filters* baseline, 4 filters were trained independently. The filters are separated with QP values in the range [22, 27], [32, 37], [42, 47], and [52] respectively. Each filter was trained for 100 epochs. With the proposed training strategy, 4 filters were trained jointly for 100 epochs. In all experiments, the filters were trained using image patches of size 256×256 and Adam optimizer [23] with a learning rate 2E-4. Note that in these experiments, the bit rates of the data points from the test methods are the same as the anchor since the test codec used the same encoder as the anchor codec.

Considering that the content of a natural image is normally not homogeneous, for example, an image may contain various regions with different smoothness and patterns. Applying content-specific filters to the whole picture does not exploit the advantages of jointly trained filters. We further studied block-wise processing, partitioning an input reconstructed image into blocks with the size of 256×256 or 128×128 pixels and applying the most suitable filter to each block. To determine the filter for a block, the encoder calculates the proxy loss of all candidate filters and selects the one with the lowest loss value. The encoder signals the index of the selected filters to the decoder along with the bitstream, resulting in 2 bits per block overhead. At the decoder side, each block is processed by the selected filter indicated by the filter index signaled by the encoder. We collected the results




Fig. 2. Neural network architecture of post-processing filters.

from both jointly trained filters and independently trained filters when the reconstructed data is processed in a block-wise manner.

Table 1 shows the BD-rate of the object detection and instance segmentation tasks of the proposed method and the baseline methods against VTM 12.0 anchor. The bold fonts show the best BD-rate values.

The BD-rates for object detection and instance segmentation tasks in Table 1 show that 4 filters trained independently or jointly outperform one filter trained for all QP values. It should be noted that the computational complexity of 4 filters is the same as the complexity of one filter at the inference time, although the number of parameters is 4 times that of the single-filter system. The results also show that independently trained filters are better than jointly trained filters when the reconstructed image is processed as a whole. This demonstrates that each filter in jointly trained filters is specialized for certain content, thus, processing the whole image using one filter does not guarantee a good performance. The independently trained filters are quality-specific, which works better in this scenario. When the input images are processed with 256x256 blocks, jointly trained filters are better than the independently trained filters on the object detection task, and slightly worse on segmentation task. When the images are processed in 128x128 blocks, jointly trained filters prove superior to independently trained filters on all machine tasks.

We also collected the statistics of the usage of each individual filter in jointly trained filters to demonstrate sample assignment, e.g., blocks in reconstructed images, with regard to the quality of the reconstructed images. The usage percentage of each filter in jointly trained filters against the sample QP values is shown in Figure 3

The results indicate that filter2 is dominant among all samples, as it processes more than 60% of the blocks across all QP values. As demonstrated in the figure, with increasing QP values, the usage of filter2 decreases from over 80% to about 50%, while the usage of other filters increases. These findings indicate that the jointly trained filters are optimized for the content of the samples rather than being solely based on the QP values.




Fig. 3. Filter usage statistics against QP values.

3.2. Study of training hyperparameters

The proposed method uses a staircase function as the cooling schedule and drops the temperature T gradually during the training. We empirically determined the parameter K defined in Eq. 7, which controls the speed of the cooling. To determine the optimal parameter K , we tested 4 different values of K : $K = 1$, $K = 3$, $K = 5$, and $K = 10$. The filters were trained for 20 epochs and their performance was evaluated on the test data. In all experiments, we set $\beta = 10$ and $T_0 = 1$. The results are shown in Table 2

Table 2 indicates that the system achieves the best performance when $K = 5$. When K is too large, the temperature decreases slowly, resulting in the filters being trained on all input samples, therefore limiting the system performance due to the capacity of each individual filter. Conversely, when K is too small, the temperature decreases too fast, causing randomly assigning the training samples to each individual filter, thus, hindering the performance of the system. This observation also showcases the inferior performance when Eq. 2 is optimized directly.

4. CONCLUSION

Post-processing filter is an efficient and convenient technique for enhancing the performance of a video/image codec or adapting an existing video/image codec for other purposes,

Table 1. Comparison of the baseline methods and the proposed training strategy against VTM 12.0 anchor.

method	Detection BD-rate	Segmentation BD-rate
one-filter	-38.3%	-39.4%
4 independent-filters	-39.82%	-42.75%
4 joint-filters	-39.1%	-40.1%
4 independent-filter (block-wise, 256×256)	-40.7%	-43.7%
4 joint-filters (block-wise, 256×256)	-42.2%	-43.6%
4 independent-filters (block-wise, 128×128)	-41.3%	-44.6%
4 joint-filters (block-wise, 128×128)	-42.3%	-44.7%

Table 2. Performance study of parameter K .

K	Detection BD-rate	Segmentation BD-rate
1 epoch	-33.13%	-36.54%
3 epochs	-33.81%	-35.680%
5 epochs	-35.212%	-39.532%
10 epochs	-33.426%	-36.960%

such as converting a conventional video/image codec designed for human into one suitable for machine vision tasks. Existing techniques utilize multiple post-processing filters within a system and optimize each filter for a range of reconstruction qualities, for example, a range of QP values. We observe that the artifacts caused by a video/image codec are also content-specific. A system with multiple post-processing filters could perform better when the filters are jointly optimized. In this paper, we proposed a training strategy that optimizes post-processing filters jointly following the principle of competitive learning. During the training stage, a training sample is assigned, in a fuzzy manner, to the filters based on the performance of each filter on the sample, such that the winning filter is further optimized for the sample to achieve a better performance. To mitigate the randomness caused by random initialization, inspired by the simulated annealing technique, we assign samples to each filter using a soft-max function with temperature as the weight allocation function and gradually decrease the temperature during the training. We evaluated the proposed training strategy with a system using multiple post-processing filters on a VVC codec [8, 6]. Following the evaluation procedure defined by the MPEG VCM standardization working group [22], we assessed the proposed system on the OpenImages dataset with the object detection and instance segmentation machine tasks. Experiments show that the content-specific filters trained with the proposed strategies outperform the filters trained independently when images are processed in blocks. The usage statistics of the jointly trained filters confirm that the filters are specific to content and reconstruction quality rather than solely focusing on reconstruction quality.

In this paper, we demonstrated the effectiveness of jointly trained post-processing filters for VCM codecs. Further ex-

periments will be performed to validate the efficiency of the proposed training strategy for conventional video codecs.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] G.J. Sullivan and T. Wiegand, "Video Compression - From Concepts to the H.264/AVC Standard," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 93, no. 1, pp. 18–31, Jan. 2005.
- [2] Benjamin Bross, Ye-Kui Wang, Yan Ye, Shan Liu, Jianle Chen, Gary J. Sullivan, and Jens-Rainer Ohm, "Overview of the Versatile Video Coding (VVC) Standard and its Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 3736–3764, Oct. 2021.
- [3] Lingyu Duan, Jiaying Liu, Wenhan Yang, Tiejun Huang, and Wen Gao, "Video Coding for Machines: A Paradigm of Collaborative Compression and Intelligent Analytics," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 8680–8695, 2020.
- [4] Wenhan Yang, Haofeng Huang, Yueyu Hu, Ling-Yu Duan, and Jiaying Liu, "Video Coding for Machine: Compact Visual Representation Compression for Intelligent Collaborative Analytics," Oct. 2021.
- [5] Wen Gao, Shan Liu, Xiaozhong Xu, Manouchehr Rafie, Yuan Zhang, and Igor Curcio, "Recent Standard Development Activities on Video Coding for Machines," May 2021.
- [6] Jukka I. Ahonen, Ramin G. Youvalari, Nam Le, Honglei Zhang, Francesco Cricri, Hamed Rezazadegan Tavakoli, Miska M. Hannuksela, and Esa Rahtu, "Learned Enhancement Filters for Image Coding for Machines," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, Nov. 2021, pp. 235–239.
- [7] Jukka Ahonen, "Image coding for machines: Deep learning based post-processing filters," M.S. thesis, 2021.
- [8] Benjamin Bross, Jianle Chen, Shan Liu, and Ye-Kui Wang, "Versatile Video Coding (Draft 8)," *Joint*

Video Experts Team (JVET), Document JVET-Q2001, Jan. 2020.

- [9] D. Marpe, T. Wiegand, and G.J. Sullivan, “The H.264/MPEG4 advanced video coding standard and its applications,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 134–143, Aug. 2006.
- [10] Chao Dong, Yubin Deng, Chen Change Loy, and Xiaoou Tang, “Compression artifacts reduction by a deep convolutional network,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2015, pp. 576–584.
- [11] Maria Santamaria, Yat-Hong Lam, Francesco Cricri, Jani Lainema, Ramin G. Youvalari, Honglei Zhang, Miska M. Hannuksela, Esa Rahtu, and Moncef Gaubuj, “Content-adaptive convolutional neural network post-processing filter,” in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, Nov. 2021, pp. 99–106.
- [12] Fan Zhang, Chen Feng, and David R. Bull, “Enhancing VVC Through Cnn-Based Post-Processing,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, July 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [13] Chen Li, Li Song, Rong Xie, and Wenjun Zhang, “CNN based post-processing to improve HEVC,” in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, Sept. 2017, pp. 4577–4580.
- [14] Ruiying Yang, Maria Santamaria, Francesco Cricri, Honglei Zhang, Jani Lainema, Ramin G. Youvalari, and Miska M. Hannuksela, “Low-precision post-filtering in video coding,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, Dec. 2022, pp. 137–140.
- [15] Jim Nilsson and Tomas Akenine-Möller, “Understanding SSIM,” *arXiv:2006.13846 [cs, eess]*, June 2020.
- [16] Nam Le, Honglei Zhang, Francesco Cricri, Ramin Ghaznavi-Youvalari, and Esa Rahtu, “Image Coding For Machines: an End-To-End Learned Approach,” in *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, June 2021, pp. 1590–1594.
- [17] Bernd Fritzsche, “Some competitive learning methods,” *Artificial Intelligence Institute, Dresden University of Technology*, vol. 100, 1997.
- [18] Teuvo Kohonen, “Essentials of the self-organizing map,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 37, pp. 52–65, Jan. 2013.
- [19] Emile Aarts, Jan Korst, and Wil Michiels, “Simulated Annealing,” in *Search Methodologies: Introductory Tutorials in Optimization and Decision Support Techniques*, Edmund K. Burke and Graham Kendall, Eds., pp. 187–210. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2005.
- [20] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, “Identity Mappings in Deep Residual Networks,” *arXiv:1603.05027 [cs]*, Mar. 2016.
- [21] Alina Kuznetsova, Hassan Rom, Neil Alldrin, Jasper Uijlings, Ivan Krasin, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Shahab Kamali, Stefan Popov, Matteo Mallocci, Alexander Kolesnikov, Tom Duerig, and Vittorio Ferrari, “The Open Images Dataset V4: Unified image classification, object detection, and visual relationship detection at scale,” *IJCV*, 2020.
- [22] ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 29/WG 04/N 311, “Common test conditions for video coding for machines,” Feb. 2023.
- [23] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba, “Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization,” Dec. 2014.