

# CONVEX-HULL ESTIMATION USING XPSNR FOR VERSATILE VIDEO CODING

Vignesh V Menon Christian R. Helmrich Adam Wiecewski Benjamin Bross Detlev Marpe

Video Communication and Applications Department, Fraunhofer HHI, Berlin, Germany


## ABSTRACT

As adaptive streaming becomes crucial for delivering high-quality video content across diverse network conditions, accurate metrics to assess perceptual quality are essential. This paper explores using the eXtended Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (XPSNR) metric as an alternative to the popular Video Multimethod Assessment Fusion (VMAF) metric for determining optimized bitrate-resolution pairs in the context of *Versatile Video Coding* (VVC). Our study is rooted in the observation that XPSNR shows a superior correlation with subjective quality scores for VVC-coded Ultra-High Definition (UHD) content compared to VMAF. We predict the average XPSNR of VVC-coded bitstreams using spatiotemporal complexity features of the video and the target encoding configuration and then determine the convex-hull online. On average, the proposed convex-hull using XPSNR (VEXUS) achieves an overall quality improvement of 5.84 dB PSNR and 0.62 dB XPSNR while maintaining the same bitrate, compared to the default UHD encoding using the VVenC encoder, accompanied by an encoding time reduction of 44.43% and a decoding time reduction of 65.46%. This shift towards XPSNR as a guiding metric shall enhance the effectiveness of adaptive streaming algorithms, ensuring an optimal balance between bitrate efficiency and perceptual fidelity with advanced video coding standards.

**Index Terms**— Convex-hull, video streaming, complexity reduction, XPSNR, VVC.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Modern video standards come with ever-increasing complexity. The newest, *Versatile Video Coding* (VVC) [1], was expected to be up to ten times more complex to encode than its predecessor, *High Efficiency Video Coding* (HEVC) [2]. Practical implementations, like the open source Versatile Video Encoder (VVenC) [3], can efficiently deal with scaling the compression efficiency versus the runtime [4] using various presets offering a trade-off between runtime and compression efficiency. The convex hull is where the encoding point achieves Pareto efficiency. Online convex-hull estimation methods emerge as a critical necessity in this landscape, providing a dynamic and adaptive means to optimize bitrate and resolution selections. By dynamically adjusting



**Fig. 1:** Rate-distortion (RD) and rate-decoding time curves of representative sequences of Inter-4K dataset [7] encoded at 540p, 1080p, and 2160p resolutions using VVenC at *faster* preset, and decoded using VTM decoder.

the bitrate-resolution pairs in response to the video content complexity and coding algorithms, these methods play a pivotal role in achieving an optimal trade-off between computational efficiency and visual fidelity in the face of the increased intricacies associated with advanced codecs like VVC [5, 6].

In content-adaptive encoding, especially for adaptive streaming applications, pursuing optimal bitrate-resolution pairs is crucial for balancing efficient video delivery and perceptual quality [8]. The Pareto-front (referred to as *convex hull* in the adaptive streaming literature) estimation methods used to determine the optimized bitrate-resolution pairs for individual video titles have been studied intensively in recent literature, motivated by the observation that specific encoding resolutions yield better quality than others in a certain bitrate range, as shown in Fig. 1. By considering the intricacies of content complexity, these methods ensure that encoding is precisely tuned to the requirements of each video, minimizing the bitrate and maximizing visual fidelity. Moreover, by selecting the optimized encoding resolution for each bitrate, we reduce the computational workload during decoding, as lower-resolution videos require less processing power and memory than their higher-resolution counterparts [9, 10],




Fig. 2: Convex-hull estimation and encoding architecture using VEXUS.

as shown in Fig. 1. One of the convex-hull estimation methods is *Bruteforce* approach, where, for a set of  $\tilde{r}$  resolutions and  $\tilde{q}$  quantization parameters (QP), video is compressed  $\tilde{r} \times \tilde{q}$  times, and then the best resolution-QP pair is selected for each target bitrate [8, 11]. Notably, the convex-hull construction is repeated for every scene. Some other techniques involve spatiotemporal complexity-adaptive encoding resolution selection, employing machine learning models to predict optimal encoding configurations [12–15]. As the demand for high-quality and low-bitrate encoding intensifies, these cutting-edge convex-hull estimation methods stand at the forefront, promising more efficient and quality-driven video streaming experiences.

Traditional convex-hull estimation methods use Video Multimethod Assessment Fusion (VMAF) [16] as the perceptual quality metric [8, 13, 15, 17]. However, as observed in [18], Peak Signal to Noise Ratio (PSNR) [19] and VMAF [16] measures fail to model the subjective quality of VVC-coded bitstreams accurately. Moreover, it was observed that Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) [20], Multi-Scale Structural Similarity Index (MS-SSIM), and eXtended Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (XPSNR) [21] can predict the subjective codec ranking reported in [22] with acceptable accuracy [23]. Hence, XPSNR appears to be a superior perceptual quality metric to VMAF when applied to VVC-coded ultra high definition (UHD) bitstreams [18]. XPSNR goes beyond traditional PSNR metrics by incorporating additional perceptual considerations, providing a more nuanced and human-like video quality assessment. XPSNR excels in aligning with the complexities introduced by VVC encoding, making it a more reliable and comprehensive metric for assessing the true perceptual quality of VVC-coded bitstreams compared to the more conventional VMAF. However, despite the efficiency gained by the faster calculation of XPSNR compared to VMAF [21], the computational demands of encoding videos at all supported resolutions and QPs, coupled with the subsequent XPSNR calculations, pose significant time and energy challenges.

Encoding and evaluating an exhaustive set of configurations becomes increasingly burdensome as the number of supported resolutions grows. To mitigate this computational bottleneck, we propose a method, VEXUS, which predicts optimized convex-hulls (using XPSNR as the quality met-

ric) for VVC encoding without requiring exhaustive encoding and quality evaluation. It includes introducing XPSNR and QP prediction models that help estimate optimized bitrate-resolution-QP triples for a given video scene.

## 2. VEXUS ARCHITECTURE

VEXUS streamlines the VVC encoding process to achieve optimal bitrate-quality trade-offs by introducing a comprehensive convex-hull estimation scheme with three distinct phases as shown in Fig. 2:

- ① Spatiotemporal complexity feature extraction;
- ② XPSNR-optimized resolution prediction;
- ③ Optimized QP prediction.

VEXUS begins with spatiotemporal feature extraction, where intricate details and motion dynamics are analyzed to capture the inherent complexity of the input video scene. Subsequently, in the optimized resolution estimation phase, VEXUS leverages the extracted features and a set of supported resolutions ( $\mathcal{R}$ ) and a set of target bitrates ( $\mathcal{B}$ ) to determine the most suitable encoding resolution. Finally, in the optimized QP estimation phase, VEXUS refines its encoding strategy by incorporating target bitrates and previously estimated resolutions to predict the optimized QP values for each bitrate-resolution pair. Through this iterative approach, VEXUS outputs bitrate-resolution-QP triples tailored to each target bitrate, ensuring efficient bitrate allocation and preserving visual quality across diverse resolutions in VVC encoding.

### 2.1. Spatiotemporal complexity feature extraction

We use seven DCT-energy-based features: the average texture energy ( $E_Y$ ), the average gradient of the luma texture energy ( $h$ ), the average luma brightness ( $L_Y$ ), Average chroma texture energy of U and V channels ( $E_U$  and  $E_V$ ), and the average chroma intensity of U and V channels ( $L_U$  and  $L_V$ ) [24] as the content complexity features of video scenes.

### 2.2. XPSNR-optimized resolution prediction

The objective of selecting the optimized resolution based on bitrate and video complexity features is decomposed into two parts:

**Modeling:** The core of the XPSNR measure is a psycho-visually inspired, simplified spatiotemporal sensitivity model specified locally for each disjoint block  $B_k$  at index  $k$ , of each input picture  $P$  of bit depth  $d$ , and size  $W \times H$  pixels, as [21]:

$$w_k = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{a}_P}{\hat{a}_k}}, \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{a}_P = 2^{2d-9} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{3840 \cdot 2160}{W \cdot H}} \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{a}_k = \max \left( \hat{a}_{\min}^2; \left( \frac{1}{4N^2} \sum_{[x,y] \in B_k} |h_s[x,y]| + 2 |h_t[x,y]| \right)^2 \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $w_k$  is the visual sensitivity weight associated with the  $N \times N$  sized  $B_k \in P$  and calculated from the visual activity measure of the block  $\hat{a}_k$  and an average overall activity  $\hat{a}_P$ .  $N$  is calculated as:

$$N = \text{round} \left( 128 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{W \cdot H}{3840 \cdot 2160}} \right). \quad (3)$$

The definitions of  $a_{\min}$ ,  $h_s$ , and  $h_t$  are provided in [23] and omitted here for brevity, and  $N^2$  is the number of picture samples in each block. A low computational complexity is reached because the spatial high-pass operator  $h_s$ , and temporal high-pass operator  $h_t$  use very simple fixed-point operations, and the square root in the calculation of  $w_k$  cancels the squaring operations in Eq. 2.

Towards this realization, XPSNR of a video scene encoded at resolution  $r$  and bitrate  $b$ , *i.e.*,  $x_{(r,b)}$  is modeled as a function of video complexity features  $\{E_Y, h, L_Y, E_U, L_U, E_V, L_V\}$ ,  $b$ , and normalized resolution height  $r' = \frac{r}{2160}$ :

$$x_{(r,b)} = f_X(E_Y, h, L_Y, E_U, L_U, E_V, L_V, b, r'). \quad (4)$$

$L_Y$ ,  $L_U$ , and  $L_V$  features consider variations in luminance and chrominance within localized regions.  $E_Y$ ,  $E_U$ , and  $E_V$  features account for variations in texture across different frame regions, providing insights into how well the compression or reconstruction method preserves textural details.  $h$  introduces a temporal dimension, where dynamic changes in texture over time influencing perceived quality are captured [15, 25].

**Resolution optimization:** In the context of resolution optimization, the goal is to enhance the XPSNR of encoded video scenes by predicting the optimized encoding resolution. This optimization process aims to select the resolution that maximizes the predicted XPSNR, thereby improving the visual quality of the encoded content. The optimization function is:

$$\hat{r} = \arg \max_{r \in \mathcal{R}; r < r_{\max}} \hat{x}_{(r,b)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\hat{x}_{(r,b)}$  is the predicted XPSNR of the video scene encoded at resolution  $r$  and bitrate  $b$ . By iteratively evaluating the XPSNR prediction for different bitrate-resolution combinations, the optimization function identifies the resolution that yields the highest predicted XPSNR, ensuring an optimal balance between bitrate utilization and visual fidelity in the encoded video scenes.

### 2.3. Optimized QP prediction

For applications such as streaming, avoiding exceeding the maximum bitrates specified in the HLS/DASH manifests [26] during the encoding process is essential. Failure to adhere to these limits can lead to buffer overflows or underflows in video players. Therefore, optimized QP is predicted for a given target bitrate for capped variable bitrate encoding.

**Modeling:** The optimized QP is modeled as a function of spatiotemporal features, target bitrate  $b$ , and normalized resolution height  $r'$  as:

$$q_{(r,b)} = f_Q(E_Y, h, L_Y, E_U, L_U, E_V, L_V, b, r'). \quad (6)$$

By considering spatiotemporal features, the encoding can adaptively adjust the QP parameter to efficiently allocate bits to different scenes within the video [27]. This ensures that the encoding gives more bits to preserve essential details in complex scenes while allocating fewer bits to simpler regions, optimizing the overall bitrate distribution. Target bitrate and resolution features serve as quality constraints and objectives for encoding. By incorporating these features into the prediction model, the encoding process can dynamically adjust the QP parameter to achieve the desired bitrate while maintaining the specified resolution.

**Optimization:** The optimization function is:

$$\hat{q}_{(r,b)} = \arg \min_{q \in [q_{\min}, q_{\max}]} |\hat{b}_{(r,q)} - b|, \quad (7)$$

where  $\hat{q}_{(r,b)}$  is the predicted QP of the scene encoded at resolution  $r$  and bitrate  $b$ . The optimization function aims to predict the QP, minimizing the discrepancy between the predicted and target bitrate for a given resolution. This function seeks to find the optimized QP value within the specified range  $[q_{\min}, q_{\max}]$  that best aligns the predicted bitrate  $\hat{b}_{r,q}$  with the target bitrate  $b$ . The chosen QP value is expected to result in an encoded scene with a bitrate that closely matches the specified target bitrate, thereby optimizing the encoding process for bitrate control.

### 2.4. Encoding

The encoding uses the predicted bitrate-resolution-QP configurations for a given input scene. In VVenC [3], the QP is specified using the `qp` option. The `maxrate` (easy mode) or `MaxBitrate` (expert mode) option is used to specify the upper bound of bitrate variability. The lower bound of the bitrate variability is indirectly achieved through the XPSNR-based perceptual QP adaptation in combination with the `qp` option [28]. This means that while the maximum bitrate is explicitly set, the encoder adjusts the QP values dynamically based on the perceptual quality model to avoid exceeding the lower bitrate threshold. This adaptive adjustment ensures that

the bitrate remains within the acceptable range without requiring explicit specification.

### 3. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

#### 3.1. Dataset preparation

We used 1000 videos of the Inter-4K dataset [7] to validate the performance of the encoding methods. We encoded the sequences at UHD (2160p) 60fps using VVenC v1.10 [3] using preset 0 (*faster*). We extracted the spatiotemporal features,  $\{E_Y, E_U, E_V, L_Y, L_U, L_V, h\}$  using VCA v2.0 [24]. We ran constant quality encoding by varying  $qp$  values from  $q_{\min}$  to  $q_{\max}$  for each resolution in  $\mathcal{R}$ . We computed full-reference PSNR and XPSNR quality metrics after the compressed video was upsampled to the original resolution (2160p), as shown in Fig. 3. We used the bi-cubic filtering algorithm for upscaling and downscaling (from 2160p) of videos.


#### 3.2. Model training

**XPSNR prediction:** We trained the XPSNR prediction models using multiple regressors, including extra-trees, XGBoost, and random forests, and we observed that the XGBoost regressor [29] performed the best consistently using our feature set. We performed five-fold cross-validation, and the results are averaged from all folds. Since these values are similar, we assume that the model generalizes well. We ensured the training set did not include segments from the same scenes in the test set. We performed a grid search to explore different combinations of hyperparameter values for the XGBoost model and selected  $max\_depth=10$ , and  $n\_estimators=400$  that maximized performance.

**QP prediction:** Since machine learning models are associated with an error during prediction, and we need our QP to be monotonic, our QP prediction framework employs a cascading approach to predict bitrate for a given QP. This method involves training distinct XGboost regression models for minimum and maximum QP values ( $q_{\min}$  and  $q_{\max}$ , respectively), enabling the prediction of the maximum ( $\hat{b}_{\max}$ ) and minimum bitrate ( $\hat{b}_{\min}$ ). Once the points ( $q_{\min}, \hat{b}_{\max}$ ) and ( $q_{\max}, \hat{b}_{\min}$ ) are estimated, the optimized QP  $\hat{q}$  for a target bitrate  $b$  is determined using linear regression [30], as follows:

$$\hat{q} = q_{\max} + \left( \frac{q_{\max} - q_{\min}}{\log(\hat{b}_{\max}) - \log(\hat{b}_{\min})} \right) \cdot \left( \log(b) - \log(\hat{b}_{\max}) \right) \quad (8)$$

The equation captures the non-linear relationship between bitrate and QP by employing a logarithmic mapping of the bitrate values. This enables finer granularity in QP adjustment, particularly for target bitrates that fall within the lower or higher ends of the predicted bitrate range. Moreover, considering both the maximum and minimum predicted bitrates



**Fig. 3:** Calculation of the groundtruth PSNR, XPSNR, and bitrate to train the prediction models. This example shows the ground truth calculation of a video encoded at 1080p with qp 30.

**Table 1:** Experimental parameters used in this paper.

Parameter	Values					
$\mathcal{R}$	{ 360, 540, 720, 1080, 1440, 2160 }					
$\mathcal{B}$	0.145	0.300	0.600	0.900	1.600	2.400
	3.400	4.500	5.800	8.100	11.600	16.800
$r_{\max}$	720		1080		2160	
Target encoder	VVenC (faster)					
Target decoder	VTM					

ensures stability and reliability in QP prediction, even in scenarios where the target bitrate varies significantly from the predicted bitrate range.


#### 3.3. Evaluation setup

We run all experiments on a dual-processor server with Intel Xeon Gold 5218R (80 cores, frequency at 2.10 GHz), where each VVenC encoding instance uses four CPU threads. We use  $q_{\min}$  and  $q_{\max}$  as 10 and 50, respectively. We run VCA using four CPU threads. The experimental parameters used to evaluate VEXUS are shown in Table 1.

**Reference methods:** We compare VEXUS with the following benchmarks:

1. *Default:* This method employs a fixed resolution encoding, *i.e.*, all bitstreams are encoded at the exact resolution as the input video.
2. *FixedLadder:* This method employs a fixed set of bitrate-resolution pairs. This paper uses the HLS bitrate ladder specified in the Apple authoring specifications [31] as the fixed set of bitrate-resolution pairs.
3. *Bruteforce:* This method determines optimized resolution, which yields the highest XPSNR for a given target bitrate after an exhaustive encoding process at all supported resolutions and QPs [8, 11].

**Performance metrics:** We compare the overall quality in PSNR [19] and XPSNR [21] and the achieved bitrate for every target bitrate of each test sequence. Bjøntegaard Delta values [32] BD-PSNR and BD-XPSNR refer to the average



(a) 0076 ( $E_Y=43.49$ ,  $h=21.70$ ), (b) 0094 ( $E_Y=148.67$ ,  $h=14.00$ ,  $L_Y=122.92$ ), (c) 0153 ( $E_Y=50.83$ ,  $h=9.80$ ,  $L_Y=93.54$ ), (d) 0263 ( $E_Y=122.64$ ,  $h=38.48$ ,  $L_Y=116.31$ )

**Fig. 4:** RD curves, encoding and decoding times of representative video sequences using *Default* (green line), *FixedLadder* (blue line), *Bruteforce* (black line), and *VEXUS* (red line) encodings.

increase in PSNR and XPSNR of the bitstreams compared with the *Default* encoding with the same bitrate, respectively. Bjøntegaard Delta rate  $BDR_P$  and  $BDR_X$  refer to the average increase in bitrate of the bitstreams compared with the *Default* encoding with the same PSNR and XPSNR, respectively. We also evaluate the average relative difference in encoding time ( $\Delta T_E$ ) and decoding time ( $\Delta T_D$ ) compared with the *Default* encoding.

#### 4. EVALUATION RESULTS

**Speed and accuracy:** We evaluate the pre-processing latency ( $\tau_p$ ) in encoding introduced by the spatiotemporal complexity feature extraction and the model inference to predict the optimized resolutions and QPs. We extract the features at an average rate of 178 fps over the entire dataset (2160p resolution). The time to predict the resolution for each target bitrate is 4 ms. The overall latency is negligible as spatiotemporal complexity feature extraction, and the XPSNR-optimized resolution prediction can be executed concurrently in real applications. The average mean absolute error (MAE) of the

XPSNR prediction model is 0.17 dB with a standard deviation of 0.22 dB, while the MAE of the QP prediction model is 1.32, with a standard deviation of 1.86.

**Rate-distortion performance:** Fig. 4 shows the RD curves of the representative videos (of various video content complexities) in the test dataset. Notably, the *Bruteforce* method consistently yields the highest XPSNR, showcasing its exhaustive search approach. Meanwhile, the RD curve of *VEXUS* closely mirrors the *Bruteforce* method, indicating the effectiveness of its predictive modeling in approximating optimized resolutions and QPs. Furthermore, Table 2 shows  $BDR_P$ ,  $BDR_X$ , BD-PSNR, and BD-XPSNR results of the considered methods compared to the *Default* encoding. *VEXUS* ( $r_{\max}=2160$ ) yields  $BDR_P$ ,  $BDR_X$ , BD-PSNR, and BD-XPSNR of  $-25.66\%$ ,  $-18.18\%$ ,  $5.84$  dB, and  $0.62$  dB. It is observed that the coding efficiency decreases as  $r_{\max}$  decreases. To further validate the efficiency of *VEXUS*, we evaluated the perceptual quality using the VMAF metric in addition to PSNR and XPSNR. BD-VMAF of *FixedLadder*, and *VEXUS* ( $r_{\max}=2160$ ) are  $-2.17$  and  $9.39$ , which confirms the

**Table 2:** Average results of the encoding schemes compared to *Default* encoding.

Method	$r_{\max}$ [pixels]	$BDR_B$ [%]	$BDR_X$ [%]	BD-PSNR [dB]	BD-XPSNR [dB]	$\Delta T_E$ [%]	$\Delta T_D$ [%]
<i>FixedLadder</i>	-	-11.86	1.35	1.53	-0.24	-52.39	-65.77
<i>Bruteforce</i>	720	-13.17	-6.29	4.65	0.51	418.96	-78.82
	1080	-19.49	-7.93	6.21	0.83	596.23	-72.60
	2160	-27.26	-20.27	7.45	1.02	1312.37	-65.12
VEXUS	720	-11.24	-3.17	2.93	0.22	-73.97	-79.06
	1080	-17.89	-6.01	4.30	0.55	-64.71	-74.27
	2160	-25.66	-18.80	5.84	0.62	-44.43	-65.46

robustness of VEXUS.

**Latency:** As resolutions decrease for a given target bitrate in VEXUS, the encoding time tends to decrease. This is because lower resolutions require less computational effort for encoding than UHD resolution. Similarly, decoding time is reduced for lower resolutions as decoding operations become less complex. Therefore, Fig. 4 demonstrates that selecting lower resolutions for a given target bitrate not only improves encoding efficiency but also lowers both encoding and decoding time compared to the *Default* encoding, making it a favorable approach for optimizing VVC encoding. As shown in Table 2, *Bruteforce* approach yields the highest encoding time, as we need to encode at all supported resolutions and QPs to determine the convex-hull. In VEXUS, the highest encoding time is observed when  $r_{\max}=2160$  due to selecting higher encoding resolutions optimized for maximum XPSNR. As  $r_{\max}$  decreases, the overall encoding and decoding time decreases, and the coding efficiency is lowered. This trade-off between quality and coding efficiency is based on the target audience, delivery platform, and available resources.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduced XPSNR as an alternative metric to the traditional VMAF metric to estimate convex-hull for VVC encoding. Our investigation stemmed from a keen observation: XPSNR demonstrated a better correlation with subjective quality scores for VVC-coded UHD content. Leveraging this insight, we introduced an approach where XPSNR is predicted for VVC-coded bitstreams using spatiotemporal complexity features of the video and the target encoding configuration. Furthermore, we propose VEXUS, where the convex-hull is estimated online using the predicted XPSNR. On average, VEXUS yields a substantial improvement of 5.84 dB in PSNR and 0.62 dB in XPSNR for the same bitrates compared to the conventional UHD encoding with the VVenC encoder, followed by a 44.43% reduction in overall encoding time, and a 65.46% reduction in overall decoding time using VTM decoder. As the demand for superior streaming experiences grows, our findings emphasize the pivotal role of XPSNR in achieving optimized bitrate-resolution pairs for VVC-coded content.

One promising avenue of future research is investigating how the insights of convex-hull can be leveraged within the encoder’s rate control mechanisms and mode decisions. By incorporating knowledge of the convex hull estimation into rate control algorithms, the encoder could dynamically adjust encoding parameters to better allocate bitrate resources, particularly in scenarios where low resolutions are utilized to enhance quality at lower bitrates.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bross *et al.*, “Overview of the Versatile Video Coding (VVC) Standard and its Applications,” in *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 31, no. 10, 2021, pp. 3736–3764.
- [2] G. J. Sullivan *et al.*, “Overview of the High Efficiency Video Coding (HEVC) Standard,” in *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 22, no. 12, 2012, pp. 1649–1668.
- [3] A. Wiecek *et al.*, “VVenC: An Open And Optimized VVC Encoder Implementation,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia & Expo Workshops (ICMEW)*, pp. 1–2.
- [4] J. Brandenburg *et al.*, “Pareto-optimized coding configurations for VVenC, a fast and efficient VVC encoder,” in *2021 IEEE 23rd International Workshop on Multimedia Signal Processing (MMSP)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [5] R. Kaafarani *et al.*, “Evaluation Of Bitrate Ladders For Versatile Video Coder,” in *2021 International Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing (VCIP)*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [6] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “Energy-Efficient Multi-Codec Bitrate-Ladder Estimation for Adaptive Video Streaming,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Visual Communications and Image Processing (VCIP)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [7] A. Stergiou and R. Poppe, “AdaPool: Exponential Adaptive Pooling for Information-Retaining Downsampling,” in *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 32, 2023, pp. 251–266.
- [8] J. De Cock *et al.*, “Complexity-based consistent-quality encoding in the cloud,” in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, 2016, pp. 1484–1488.
- [9] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “Video Super-Resolution for Optimized Bitrate and Green Online Streaming,” in *2024 Picture Coding Symposium (PCS)*, 2024.

- [10] Z. Azimi *et al.*, “Decoding Complexity-Aware Bitrate-Ladder Estimation for Adaptive VVC Streaming,” in *32nd European Signal Processing Conference (EU-SIPCO)*, 2024.
- [11] C. Chen *et al.*, “Optimized Transcoding for Large Scale Adaptive Streaming Using Playback Statistics,” in *2018 25th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, 2018, pp. 3269–3273.
- [12] A. V. Katsenou *et al.*, “Content-gnostic Bitrate Ladder Prediction for Adaptive Video Streaming,” in *2019 Picture Coding Symposium (PCS)*, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [13] A. Zabrovskiy *et al.*, “FAUST: Fast Per-Scene Encoding Using Entropy-Based Scene Detection and Machine Learning,” in *2021 30th Conference of Open Innovations Association FRUCT*, 2021, pp. 292–302.
- [14] M. Bhat *et al.*, “Combining Video Quality Metrics To Select Perceptually Accurate Resolution In A Wide Quality Range: A Case Study,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, 2021, pp. 2164–2168.
- [15] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “JND-Aware Two-Pass Per-Title Encoding Scheme for Adaptive Live Streaming,” in *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2024, pp. 1281–1294.
- [16] Z. Li *et al.*, “VMAF: The journey continues,” *Netflix Technology Blog*, vol. 25, 2018.
- [17] F. Nasiri *et al.*, “Ensemble Learning for Efficient VVC Bitrate Ladder Prediction,” in *2022 10th European Workshop on Visual Information Processing (EUVIP)*, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [18] C. R. Helmrich *et al.*, “Information on and analysis of the VVC encoders in the SDR UHD verification test,” in *WG 05 MPEG Joint Video Coding Team(s) with ITU-T SG 16, document JVET-T0103*, Oct. 2020.
- [19] Alliance For Telecommunications Industry Solutions, “Objective Video Quality Measurement Using A Peak-Signal-To-Noise-Ratio (PSNR) Full Reference Technique,” *T1.TR.74-2001*, 2001.
- [20] Z. Wang *et al.*, “Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity,” in *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2004, pp. 600–612.
- [21] C. R. Helmrich *et al.*, “XPSNR: A Low-Complexity Extension of The Perceptually Weighted Peak Signal-To-Noise Ratio For High-Resolution Video Quality Assessment,” in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2020, pp. 2727–2731.
- [22] M. Wien and V. Baroncini, “Report on VVC compression performance verification testing in the SDR UHD Random Access Category,” in *WG 05 MPEG Joint Video Coding Team(s) with ITU-T SG 16, document JVET-T0097*, Oct. 2020.
- [23] C. R. Helmrich *et al.*, “A study of the extended perceptually weighted peak signal-to-noise ratio (XP-SNR) for video compression with different resolutions and bit depths,” in *ITU Journal: ICT Discoveries*, vol. 3, May 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://handle.itu.int/11.1002/pub/8153d78b-en>
- [24] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “Green Video Complexity Analysis for Efficient Encoding in Adaptive Video Streaming,” in *First International ACM Green Multimedia Systems Workshop (GMSys '23)*, 2023.
- [25] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “Video Quality Assessment with Texture Information Fusion for Streaming Applications,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd Mile-High Video Conference*, 2024, p. 1–6.
- [26] I. Sodagar, “The MPEG-DASH Standard for Multimedia Streaming Over the Internet,” *IEEE MultiMedia*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 62–67, 2011.
- [27] V. V. Menon *et al.*, “All-Intra Rate Control Using Low Complexity Video Features for Versatile Video Coding,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, 2023, pp. 2760–2764.
- [28] C. R. Helmrich *et al.*, “Fast constant-quality video encoding using VVenC with rate capping based on pre-analysis statistics,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, 2024.
- [29] T. Chen and C. Guestrin, “XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Aug. 2016, pp. 785–794.
- [30] A. Premkumar *et al.*, “Quality-Aware Dynamic Resolution Adaptation Framework for Adaptive Video Streaming,” in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference*, 2024, p. 292–298.
- [31] Apple Inc., “HLS Authoring Specification for Apple Devices.” [Online]. Available: <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/http-live-streaming/hls-authoring-specification-for-apple-devices>
- [32] HSTP-VID-WPOM, “Working practices using objective metrics for evaluation of video coding efficiency experiments,” in *International Telecommunication Union*, 2020.