

L^2 FMamba: Lightweight Light Field Image Super-Resolution with State Space Model

Zeqiang Wei*, Kai Jin*, Zeyi Hou, Kuan Song, Xiuzhuang Zhou, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Transformers bring significantly improved performance to the light field image super-resolution task due to their long-range dependency modeling capability. However, the inherently high computational complexity of their core self-attention mechanism has increasingly hindered their advancement in this task. To address this issue, we first introduce the LF-VSSM block, a novel module inspired by progressive feature extraction, to efficiently capture critical long-range spatial-angular dependencies in light field images. LF-VSSM successively extracts spatial features within sub-aperture images, spatial-angular features between sub-aperture images, and spatial-angular features between light field image pixels. On this basis, we propose a lightweight network, L^2 FMamba (Lightweight Light Field Mamba), which integrates the LF-VSSM block to leverage light field features for super-resolution tasks while overcoming the computational challenges of Transformer-based approaches. Extensive experiments on multiple light field datasets demonstrate that our method reduces the number of parameters and complexity while achieving superior super-resolution performance with faster inference speed.

Index Terms—light field, super-resolution, state space model, lightweight.

I. INTRODUCTION

UNLIKE traditional 2D imaging that only records pixel intensity (i.e., spatial information), light field (LF) imaging captures the intensity and directional information of light rays (i.e., angular information), allowing for the precise depiction of light distribution in 3D space. This grants LF images a broader range of functionalities in post-processing, such as refocusing [1], depth estimation [2], and stereoscopic display [3]. As a result, the flexibility of image editing and computational photography is enhanced, and new avenues are opened for research and applications across various domains. The inherent hardware design of LF cameras creates a trade-off between angular and spatial resolutions, often resulting in sub-aperture images (SAIs) with low spatial resolution. This limitation significantly restricts the practical applications of LF images. Accordingly, the light field image super-resolution (LFSR) task has been proposed and extensively studied.

Effectively capturing the inherent long-range spatial-angular contextual dependencies in LF images is key to solving

the LFSR task. Although scholars have attempted to use convolution-based methods [4], [5] to model and extract various spatial-angular features from different LF image representations, including sub-aperture image array (SAIs), macro-pixel images (MacPI), and epipolar plane images (EPI), they are constrained by the narrow receptive fields of convolution. This limitation hinders the full utilization of long-range spatial-angular features. In recent years, numerous researchers have applied Transformer-based methods to tackle the LFSR task. Transformer-based methods [6]–[10] leverage the attention mechanism to effectively model long-range dependencies and extract spatial-angular features. However, their quadratic complexity in terms of computation and memory significantly bottleneck their development.

Given the challenges posed by Transformer-based methods, particularly their high computational complexity, recent research has explored alternative approaches, and the state space model (SSM) [11] has emerged as a strong competitor. Among these, Mamba [12] and its variants have shown performance comparable to or even surpassing Transformers in tasks like computer vision and natural language processing. Inspired by these advances, we develop a Light Field Vision State Space Model (LF-VSSM) block to efficiently capture critical long-range spatial-angular dependencies in LFSR tasks through a progressive feature extraction strategy [13], [14]. LF-VSSM successively extracts spatial features within sub-images, spatial-angular features between sub-images, and spatial-angular features between light field image pixels. Consequently, it enhances the modeling of complex spatial-angular relationships, thereby improving LFSR performance. The LF-VSSM module can replace the CNN or Transformer feature extraction components in existing LFSR networks, thereby enabling seamless integration with current architectures. Based on this module, we propose a novel lightweight network, L^2 FMamba (Lightweight Light Field Mamba), specifically designed for light field image data. This network aims to improve reconstruction quality while reducing computational complexity, featuring fewer parameters, lower computational load, and faster inference speed, which in turn significantly enhances the overall performance on the LFSR task. The proposed method is validated on several widely used LFSR datasets, and the experimental results convincingly demonstrate its effectiveness.

In summary, the key contributions are as follows:

- We introduce a novel LF-VSSM block that utilizes a progressive spatial-angular feature extraction strategy, significantly enhancing LFSR performance by effectively capturing long-range contextual dependencies within LF

* Equal contribution. Corresponding author: Xiuzhuang Zhou.

Zeqiang Wei, Zeyi Hou, and Xiuzhuang Zhou are with the School of Artificial Intelligence, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100088, China (email: weizeqiang@bupt.edu.cn, houziye@bupt.edu.cn, xiuzhuang.zhou@bupt.edu.cn). Kai Jin is with the Bigo Technology Pte. Ltd., Beijing 100020, China (email: jinkai@bigo.sg). Kuan Song is with the Explorer Global (Suzhou) Artificial Intelligence Technology Co., Ltd., Suzhou, Jiangsu 215123, China (email: songkuan@explorer.global).

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61972046, and additionally supported by BUPT Excellent Ph.D. Students Foundation under grant CX2021120.

images.

- We propose a novel lightweight network, L^2 FMamba, for LFSR tasks, significantly reducing the number of parameters and computational cost.
- We conduct extensive experiments on five commonly used LF datasets. Our method achieves the current state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on 2x and 4x LFSR tasks. Ablation studies further validate the effectiveness, efficiency, and scalability of the proposed network.

II. RELATED WORK

Unlike single-image super-resolution (SISR) tasks, LF images typically consist of multiple SAIs with interrelated and complementary angular and spatial information. Therefore, effectively leveraging this complementary information is often crucial for determining LFSR performance.

A. CNN-based Light Field Super-Resolution

Since LFCNN [15] first introduced convolutional neural networks (CNN) into LFSR, various improvements based on CNN have emerged continuously, and modeling methods have been constantly evolving, making it the primary approach for LFSR tasks. With LF-InterNet [16], two CNN feature extractors were designed to decouple and extract spatial and angular features, and the spatial-angular interaction mechanism was proposed to gradually integrate the extracted LF image features, thereby significantly enhancing LFSR performance. DistgSSR [4] introduced the disentangling mechanism, extracting spatial, angular, and EPI information separately from various representations of LF data. However, these methods are limited by the narrow receptive fields of convolutions, hindering their ability to effectively model long-range spatial-angular features in LF images, which ultimately affects the performance of the LFSR task.

B. Transformer-based Light Field Super-Resolution

In recent years, Transformers have achieved tremendous success and rapid development in computer vision due to its self-attention mechanism. Compared to CNN, this self-attention mechanism enables the Transformer to capture global relationships and long-range dependencies in images effectively. In DPT [6], a spatial-angular locally-enhanced self-attention layer was designed to extract non-local contextual information from multiple views and preserve image details for each single view, thus better characterizing the geometric structure of LF images. A new paradigm was proposed in LFT [7], namely angular and spatial Transformers, aimed at integrating angular and spatial information in LF. With a smaller model size and lower computational cost, it achieved superior SR performance. EPIT [8] employed Transformers to model horizontal and vertical EPIs, enabling the learning of non-local spatial-angular correlations, thereby enhancing the robustness of SR under large-disparity conditions. LF-DET [9] relied on multi-scale angular modeling to address SR of scenes under different disparity ranges and reduced the computational cost required for global spatial feature modeling

of SAIs by introducing subsampling spatial modeling. M2MT [10] reveals the subspace isolation limitation caused by the decomposition and proposes a many-to-many transformer to achieve cross-subspace global interaction, thereby significantly enhancing LFSR performance through non-local context modeling. Although these works attempt to address the high computational complexity of Transformers, they still suffer from the inherent limitations of the attention mechanism, as convolution is limited by its local receptive field. Therefore, an efficient alternative solution is urgently needed.

C. Mamba-based Light Field Super-Resolution

Mamba [12] features linear-time sequence modeling with a selective state space model (SSM) [11] layer and a hardware-friendly design, effectively addressing the computational challenges that Transformers face when processing long sequences. This allows for more efficient capture of long-range dependencies while significantly accelerating inference. Since Vision Mamba [17] and Vmamba [18] successfully introduced Mamba into computer vision, this model has found broad applications in tasks such as detection, segmentation, image restoration, point cloud processing, and 3D reconstruction, leading to a significant increase in related publications. MambaIR [19] was the first to apply this model to image restoration, introducing an enhanced Residual State Space module that effectively leverages local information and reduces redundancy. This approach has outperformed strong CNN and Transformer baselines in various image restoration tasks, underscoring the powerful potential of the Mamba model in this domain. DVMSR [20] further compressed the parameters of the Mamba model through a feature distillation strategy, proposing a lightweight super-resolution model delivering comparable performance with fewer parameters. While Mamba-based super-resolution methods have demonstrated excellent performance in SISR tasks, their direct application to LF images often yields suboptimal results as they neglect the unique spatial and angular characteristics of such images.

LFMamba [21] was the first to introduce Mamba into the LFSR task by applying SSM to various two-dimensional slices of the LF image, thereby effectively extracting spatial context, angular, and structural information. In contrast, MLFSR [22] proposed a bidirectional subspace scanning scheme to efficiently model the complex four-dimensional correlations inherent in LF images. Both approaches employ vertical and horizontal Epipolar Plane Images (EPIs) to model angular relationships. However, EPI-based methods rely solely on information from a single epipolar line, which imposes significant locality constraints; they neglect the intricate structural relationships between different epipolar lines and thus struggle to capture global dependencies across these lines, ultimately limiting the integration of global contextual information. In contrast, our method directly performs angular relationship learning on SAIs and MacPI, with SAIs used to model inter-image angular correlations and MacPI dedicated to capturing angular variations at the pixel level. This approach not only effectively overcomes the shortcomings of EPI-based methods in capturing cross-epipolar information, but also leverages the




Fig. 1. The architecture of the proposed L^2 FMamba. \odot represents feature concatenation, and \oplus represents feature addition.

long-range dependency modeling capability of the Mamba framework by comprehensively integrating global contextual information across the entire LF images. This further enhances LFSR performance while reducing parameters and computational complexity.

III. METHOD

This section first provides an overview of the network architecture of L^2 FMamba, followed by a detailed explanation of the design rationale behind the LF-VSSM block.

A. Overview

Start with a low-resolution LF image $I_{lr} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times H) \times (V \times W) \times 1}$, where $U \times V$ denotes the angular resolution, $H \times W$ represents the spatial resolution of the SAI, and 1 refers to the Y channel in the $YCbCr$ color space. Based on [7]–[9], an initial spatial convolution $SpaConv$ is designed to obtain the initial LF features $F_{init} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times V) \times H \times W \times C}$, where C represents the feature dimension, which is set to a default value of 64. To extract angular information more effectively, a learnable angular positional encoding is designed, $P_{ang} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times V) \times 1 \times 1 \times C}$. This encoding is then added to F_{init} to produce angularly enriched features, denoted as F_{init}^{ang} . While spatial positional encoding is commonly used in Transformer-based methods, our design incorporates multiple selective scan directions in SSM, thus providing the model with spatial position awareness, as validated by our ablation experiments. Moreover, fixed-length encoding may have adaptability issues across different resolutions, potentially compromising the robustness of the model. Therefore, we chose not to implement any spatial positional encoding. Subsequently, F_{init}^{ang} through K sequentially stacked LF-VSSM blocks, resulting in $\{Out_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times V) \times H \times W \times C} | i \in [1, K]\}$, where K is set to a default of 4. The above outputs are concatenated along the channel dimension and passed through $AggConv$ to obtain the aggregated feature F_{agg} , where $AggConv$ is a simple single-layer convolution neural network with the kernel size of $3 \times 3 \times (K \times C) \times C$. Following the typical setup of deep super-resolution tasks, we employed residual learning methods to capture subtle differences between high-

and low-resolution images rather than aiming for a direct and exact mapping from low to high resolution. The LF image residual $R_{hr} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times V) \times \alpha H \times \alpha W \times 1}$ is obtained through the pixel shuffle residual upsampling module, where α represents the ratio of super-resolution, which is set to 2 or 4 in this paper. The final high-resolution LF image I_{hr} is obtained through the up-sampling module of I_{lr} and adding residual output R_{hr} . Fig. 1 illustrates the network architecture and data pipeline of L^2 FMamba.

B. LF-VSSM Block

The LF-VSSM block consists of three sequential sub-modules: Intra-SSM for spatial feature extraction, Inter-SSM for spatial-angular features between SAIs, and MacPI-SSM for inter-macro-pixel spatial-angular features extraction. These modules progressively integrate the angular features of the light field with the spatial features of the images, thereby enhancing the feature representation learning necessary for LFSR tasks.

1) *Intra-SSM*: The Intra-SSM module takes SAI features $In_{SAI} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times V) \times H \times W \times C}$ as input and focuses on spatial feature extraction, as shown in Fig. 2(a). Similar to conventional Transformer architectures, this module includes Intra 2D-Selective-Scan (Intra-SS2D) and Feed-Forward Neural Network (FFN) layers. First, we normalize In_{SAI} using layer normalization (LN) to stabilize training and improve convergence speed. Intra-SS2D is then employed to model global contextual relationships within each SAI, thus enhancing spatial feature extraction. This process, expressed as

$$Z_{SAI} = \text{Intra-SS2D}(\text{LN}(In_{SAI})) + In_{SAI} \quad (1)$$

is crucial for maintaining and propagating spatial information effectively through residual connections.

Since this module is dedicated to spatial feature extraction from SAIs without considering angular information, the images are treated as regular 2D ones. We apply the 2D selective scanning method from VMamba [18], unfolding the 2D image into four 1D sequences in top-down, left-right, bottom-up, and right-left directions, as shown in Fig. 3(a). After feature extraction, these sequences are merged to reconstruct the original 2D shape.




Fig. 2. Illustration of the network structure of (a) Intra-SSM, (b) Inter-SSM, and (c) MacPI-SSM. \textcircled{S} represents the learnable adjustment factor λ .

Inspired by LocalViT [23], we augmented the FFN module by incorporating a 3×3 depth-wise convolution (DWConv) layer. This layer leverages its local receptive field to better capture and integrate local spatial features within the SAI. Additionally, a learnable adjustment factor λ is applied at the residual connection of FFN to control the relative importance between global and local features:

$$Out_{SAI} = DWConv(LN(Z_{SAI})) + \lambda \cdot Z_{SAI} \quad (2)$$

This layer ensures that global and local spatial patterns are effectively captured, providing consistent improvements in spatial feature aggregation and representation across the model.

It is worth noting that in the Intra-SS2D module, the DWConv layer is used to capture the local spatial structure of the input image, thereby extracting more fine-grained local features. Meanwhile, in the FFN module, the DWConv layer is applied after the global attention module has extracted features, further integrating and enhancing the aggregation of local information. Although both modules employ DWConv, they serve different purposes in capturing local details and consolidating local information, forming a complementary design.

2) *Inter-SSM*: We restructure the Intra-SSM outputs from the same LF image into $In_{SAIs} \in \mathbb{R}^{(U \times H) \times (V \times W) \times C}$. This serves as the input to Intra-SSM. This module aims to extract spatial features within SAIs, which are sub-images of the same SAI image, while also capturing long-range angular dependencies across these multiple SAIs. The Inter-SSM network structure, as shown in Fig. 2(b), is similar to that of Intra-SSM but with two key differences. First, convolution operations applied to SAI features can disrupt the original spatial structure, introducing unnecessary noise at the edges where the SAIs connect. To mitigate this defect, we have removed the DWConv operation after the MLP. Second, in the FFN layer, we introduce a transformation operator that converts SAI features back into SAI features, enabling effective integration

of local spatial and global light field features. The computation process of Inter-SSM can be formalized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} In_{SAIs} &= Op^{SAI \rightarrow SAIs}(Out_{SAI}) \\ Z_{SAIs} &= Inter\text{-}SS2D(LN(In_{SAIs})) + In_{SAIs} \\ Z_{SAIs} &= Op^{SAIs \rightarrow SAI}(Z_{SAIs}) \\ Out_{SAIs} &= DWConv(LN(Z_{SAI})) + \lambda \cdot Z_{SAIs} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To adapt to the representation of SAIs in LF images, we adjusted the scanning directions in the Inter-SS2D layer. Following a progressive feature extraction design, this module first prioritizes extracting spatial features within SAIs before capturing angular contextual relationships between SAIs. We decompose the scanning directions into two components: spatial scanning directions within the image, $D_{spa} = \{d_{spa}^1, d_{spa}^2, d_{spa}^3, d_{spa}^4\}$, and angular directions between images, $D_{ang} = \{d_{ang}^1, d_{ang}^2, d_{ang}^3, d_{ang}^4\}$. Indices 1-4 correspond to the top-down, left-right, bottom-up, and right-left directions. Spatial scanning is performed first, followed by angular scanning, forming a complete scanning path shown in Fig. 3(b).

The window-based scanning method in LocalMamba [24] is the most similar to our approach. When the window size is set to match the SAI size, the methods are identical in implementation. However, our method starts with scanning within the SAI image to better extract spatial-angular features, contrasting with LocalMamba, which focuses on image-bias induction for finer local feature extraction.

3) *MacPI-SSM*: We restructure the Inter-SSM outputs into $In_{MacPI} \in \mathbb{R}^{(H \times U) \times (W \times V) \times C}$, which serves as the input to MacPI-SSM. This module aims to extract long-range angular contextual dependencies between pixels in SAIs. The MacPI-SSM network structure is essentially the same as that of the above Inter-SSM, and the design principles are also similar, except that a transformation operator from MacPI to SAI is used instead of the corresponding operation in the FFN layer,




Fig. 3. Illustration of the selective scan directions of (a) Intra-SS2D, (b) Inter-SS2D, and (c) MacPI-SS2D. The first column represents the inputs of different LF data structures, where the same color indicates the same viewpoint, and different colors indicate different viewpoints. The last four columns represent four different scanning directions, with the red arrows indicating the scanning route and order.

as shown in Fig. 2(c). The computation process of MacPI-SSM is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 In_{MacPI} &= Op^{SAI \rightarrow MacPI}(Out_{SAIs}) \\
 Z_{MacPI} &= MacPI-SS2D(LN(In_{MacPI})) + In_{MacPI} \\
 Z_{MacPI} &= Op^{MacPI \rightarrow SAI}(Z_{MacPI}) \\
 Out_{MacPI} &= DWConv(LN(Z_{MacPI})) + \lambda \cdot Z_{MacPI}
 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the MacPI-SS2D layer, we redesign the scanning method to accommodate the MacPI data format by introducing a two-part scanning method for spatial and angular information. Specifically, the angular scanning D_{ang} is performed first within each macro-pixel, followed by spatial scanning D_{spa} between macro-pixels. The directions indexed by $\{d_{ang}^i, d_{spa}^i\}$ form the complete scanning path, as detailed in Fig. 3(c).

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets and Implementation Details

Based on previous studies [26], [33], [34], we conducted experimental validation on five datasets, which include three real LF datasets: EPFL [35], INRIA [36], and STF-gantry [37], as well as two synthetic LF datasets: HCIold [38] and HCInew [39]. We followed the same data protocol to partition the training and test sets. We angularly cropped the central 5×5 SAIs to generate training and test samples. During training, we cropped each SAI into square patches with sides of $64 / 128$ and then applied $2 \times / 4 \times$ bicubic downsampling to generate LR patches, respectively. We employed peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) and structural similarity (SSIM) as evaluation

metrics. Firstly, we computed the average metric scores of the Y channel across all SAIs within each scene as the evaluation metric for that scene. Finally, we averaged the metric scores across all scenes in the dataset to obtain the evaluation metric for the dataset.

The default configuration of our L^2 FMamba network is as follows: the initial feature dimension $C = 64$, the number of LF-VSSM blocks $K = 4$, the SSM state dimension $d_{state} = 16$, and the SSM feature expansion factor $ssm-ratio = 1.0$, aiming to balance performance and efficiency. We employed the Adam optimizer with L1 loss and the StepLR scheduler, where the learning rate decreased by a factor of 0.5 every 30 epochs. The model was trained with an initial learning rate of 2.5×10^{-4} for 180 epochs. We augmented the training data using random horizontal and vertical flipping, as well as 90-degree rotations.

B. Comparison with the State-of-The-Arts

We compared our method L^2 FMamba to 16 SOTA methods, including both SISR and LFSR methods. Specifically, RCAN [25] is an SISR method based on CNN models. In the LFSR methods, except for DPT [6], LFT [7], EPIT [8], and LF-DET [9], which are based on the Transformer, as well as LFMamba [21] and MLFSR [22], which are based on SSM, all other methods are based on the CNN models (*i.e.*, LFSSR [27], MEG-Net [29], LFSSR_SAV [32], LF-ATO [28], LFIINet [30], DistgSSR [4], and HLFSSR-SSR [31]). To achieve a fair comparison, the above methods were trained under the same experimental conditions.

TABLE I
PSNR/SSIM RESULTS COMPARED WITH SOTA METHODS FOR $2\times$ AND $4\times$ LFSR TASKS. THE BEST AND THE SECOND BEST RESULTS ARE RESPECTIVELY IN BOLD AND UNDERLINED.

Method	Scale	EPFL	HCI _{New}	HCI _{old}	INRIA	STFgantry	Average
RCAN [25]	$\times 2$	33.156/0.9635	35.022/0.9603	41.125/0.9875	35.036/0.9769	36.670/0.9831	36.202/0.9743
resLF [26]	$\times 2$	33.617/0.9706	36.685/0.9739	43.422/0.9932	35.395/0.9804	38.354/0.9904	37.495/0.9817
LFSSR [27]	$\times 2$	33.671/0.9744	36.802/0.9749	43.811/0.9938	35.279/0.9832	37.944/0.9898	37.501/0.9832
LF-ATO [28]	$\times 2$	34.272/0.9757	37.244/0.9767	44.205/0.9942	36.171/0.9842	39.636/0.9929	38.306/0.9847
MEG-Net [29]	$\times 2$	34.312/0.9773	37.424/0.9777	44.097/0.9942	36.103/0.9849	38.767/0.9915	38.141/0.9851
DistgSSR [4]	$\times 2$	34.809/0.9787	37.959/0.9796	44.943/0.9949	36.586/0.9859	40.404/0.9942	38.940/0.9867
LF-InterNet [16]	$\times 2$	34.112/0.9760	37.170/0.9763	44.573/0.9946	35.829/0.9843	38.435/0.9909	38.024/0.9844
LF-IINet [30]	$\times 2$	34.736/0.9773	37.768/0.9790	44.852/0.9948	36.564/0.9853	39.894/0.9936	38.763/0.9860
HLFSR-SSR [31]	$\times 2$	35.310/0.9800	<u>38.317/0.9807</u>	44.978/0.9950	<u>37.060/0.9867</u>	40.849/0.9947	39.303/0.9874
LFSSR_SAV [32]	$\times 2$	34.616/0.9772	37.425/0.9776	44.216/0.9942	36.364/0.9849	38.689/0.9914	38.262/0.9851
DPT [6]	$\times 2$	34.490/0.9758	37.355/0.9771	44.302/0.9943	36.409/0.9843	39.429/0.9926	38.397/0.9848
LFT [7]	$\times 2$	34.783/0.9776	37.766/0.9788	44.625/0.9947	36.539/0.9853	40.408/0.9941	38.825/0.9861
EPIT [8]	$\times 2$	34.826/0.9775	38.228/0.9810	<u>45.075/0.9949</u>	36.672/0.9853	42.166/0.9957	39.393/0.9869
LF-DET [9]	$\times 2$	35.262/0.9797	38.314/0.9807	<u>44.986/0.9950</u>	36.949/0.9864	<u>41.762/0.9855</u>	<u>39.455/0.9874</u>
MLFSR [22]	$\times 2$	35.218/0.9801	38.140/0.9803	44.904/0.9950	36.919/0.9865	40.975/0.9949	39.231/0.9873
LFMamba [21]	$\times 2$	35.758/0.9824	38.368/0.9801	44.985/0.9950	<u>37.063/0.9876</u>	40.954/0.9948	39.424/0.9881
L^2 FMamba (Ours)	$\times 2$	<u>35.515/0.9796</u>	38.225/0.9803	44.953/0.9949	37.165/0.9862	<u>41.567/0.9952</u>	39.485/0.9873
RCAN [25]	$\times 4$	27.904/0.8863	29.694/0.8886	35.359/0.9548	29.800/0.9276	29.021/0.9131	30.355/0.9141
resLF [26]	$\times 4$	28.260/0.9035	30.723/0.9107	36.705/0.9682	30.338/0.9412	30.191/0.9372	31.243/0.9322
LFSSR [27]	$\times 4$	28.596/0.9118	30.928/0.9145	36.907/0.9696	30.585/0.9467	30.570/0.9426	31.517/0.9370
LF-ATO [28]	$\times 4$	28.514/0.9115	30.880/0.9135	36.999/0.9699	30.710/0.9484	30.607/0.9430	31.542/0.9373
MEG-Net [29]	$\times 4$	28.749/0.9160	31.103/0.9177	37.287/0.9716	30.674/0.9490	30.771/0.9453	31.717/0.9399
DistgSSR [4]	$\times 4$	28.992/0.9195	31.380/0.9217	37.563/0.9732	30.994/0.9519	31.649/0.9534	32.116/0.9439
LF-InterNet [16]	$\times 4$	28.812/0.9162	30.961/0.9161	37.150/0.9716	30.777/0.9491	30.365/0.9409	31.613/0.9388
LF-IINet [30]	$\times 4$	29.048/0.9188	31.331/0.9208	37.620/0.9734	31.039/0.9515	31.261/0.9502	32.060/0.9429
HLFSR-SSR [31]	$\times 4$	29.196/0.9222	31.571/0.9238	37.776/0.9742	31.241/0.9543	31.641/0.9537	32.285/0.9456
LFSSR_SAV [32]	$\times 4$	29.368/0.9223	31.450/0.9217	37.497/0.9721	31.270/0.9531	31.362/0.9505	32.189/0.9439
DPT [6]	$\times 4$	28.939/0.9170	31.196/0.9188	37.412/0.9721	30.964/0.9503	31.150/0.9488	31.932/0.9414
LFT [7]	$\times 4$	29.261/0.9209	31.433/0.9215	37.633/0.9735	31.218/0.9524	31.794/0.9543	32.268/0.9445
EPIT [8]	$\times 4$	29.339/0.9197	31.511/0.9231	37.677/0.9737	31.372/0.9526	<u>32.179/0.9571</u>	32.416/0.9452
LF-DET [9]	$\times 4$	29.473/0.9230	31.558/0.9235	37.843/0.9744	31.388/0.9534	32.139/0.9573	32.480/0.9463
MLFSR [22]	$\times 4$	29.283/0.9218	31.564/0.9235	37.831/0.9745	31.241/0.9531	<u>32.031/0.9567</u>	32.389/0.9235
LFMamba [21]	$\times 4$	29.840/0.9256	31.695/0.9249	37.912/0.9748	31.808/0.9551	31.846/0.9553	<u>32.620/0.9471</u>
L^2 FMamba (Ours)	$\times 4$	<u>29.681/0.9233</u>	<u>31.647/0.9243</u>	<u>37.864/0.9745</u>	<u>31.728/0.9543</u>	32.198/0.9574	32.623/0.9468

1) *Quantitative Results*: The quantitative results of L^2 FMamba and other SOTA methods are presented in Table I. Our method demonstrates competitive results across all datasets for $2\times$ and $4\times$ LFSR tasks. Specifically, in the $4\times$ LFSR task, our method achieves the best results. Overall, our performance is comparable to LFMamba. However, on the STFgantry dataset, which features large disparities, our method outperforms it by 0.35 dB. This demonstrates that our strategy of directly modeling angular information on SAIs and MacPI is more effective in capturing long-range dependencies. In the $2\times$ LFSR task, where the advantage of long-range modeling is relatively weakened, our method still achieves performance comparable to MLFSR. Notably, in subsequent experiments, we further validate the scalability of our method, showing that a significant performance improvement can be achieved with only a slight increase in parameters.

2) *Qualitative Results*: Fig. 4 presents the qualitative results of error maps for different methods on the $4\times$ LFSR task. Compared to other methods, our approach demonstrates superior texture detail restoration and edge sharpness. In different scenes, such as the bottle contours and text details in "EPFL/Bikes", and the hand contours and shield details in "Stanford Gantry/Tarot Cards S", our method shows outstanding performance. Our model not only leads in detail

preservation but also achieves the highest PSNR and SSIM scores in the corresponding regions, demonstrating excellent performance in both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. In particular, compared to LFMamba, our method achieves similar or even superior qualitative and quantitative results, with fewer parameters and lower complexity, which fully demonstrates the efficiency of our approach.

3) *Computational Efficiency*: We comprehensively compared the computational efficiency of L^2 FMamba with other methods in terms of parameters, FLOPs, and inference time. As shown in Table II, the proposed method achieves SOTA performance in the LFSR task with fewer model parameters, lower computational complexity, and faster inference. It is worth noting that our method currently lags behind typical CNN-based methods (such as LFSSR, LFSSR-SAV, LF-IINet, and DistgSSR) in terms of inference speed. This is mainly due to CNN architectures benefiting from highly optimized computational libraries, such as cuDNN, which fully leverage the parallel computing power of GPUs. In contrast, our method is based on the SSM module, while theoretically excelling in modeling long-range dependencies, still faces ongoing engineering optimization and hardware acceleration support. Nevertheless, compared to Transformer-based methods such as EPIT, HLFSR-SSR, and LF-DET, our method reduces the model parameter count by 35%-48%, lowers computational




Fig. 4. Qualitative visualization results for $4\times$ LFSR compared to other methods. Here, we show the error maps of the reconstructed center-view images, with representative regions indicated by arrows. PSNR/SSIM values for the corresponding region are provided below.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF PARAMETERS, FLOPS, TIME, AND AVERAGE PSNR/SSIM VALUES FOR $\times 2$ AND $\times 4$ SR. FLOPS AND TIME ARE CALCULATED ON AN INPUT LF WITH A SIZE OF $5 \times 5 \times 32 \times 32$.

Method	Scale	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Time(ms)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
LFSSR [27]	$\times 2$	0.89M	25.70	10.0	37.501/0.9832
MEG-Net [29]	$\times 2$	1.69M	48.40	31.2	38.141/0.9851
LFSSR_SAV [32]	$\times 2$	1.22M	31.11	14.0	38.262/0.9851
LF-ATO [28]	$\times 2$	1.22M	597.66	85.6	38.306/0.9847
LF-IINet [30]	$\times 2$	5.04M	56.16	20.6	38.763/0.9860
DistgSSR [4]	$\times 2$	3.53M	64.11	24.2	38.940/0.9867
HLFSSR-SSR [31]	$\times 2$	13.72M	167.81	31.1	39.303/0.9874
LFT [7]	$\times 2$	1.11M	56.16	91.4	38.825/0.9861
DPT [6]	$\times 2$	3.73M	65.34	98.5	38.397/0.9848
EPIT [8]	$\times 2$	1.42M	69.71	32.2	39.393/0.9869
LF-DET [9]	$\times 2$	1.59M	48.50	65.9	39.455/0.9874
MLFSR [22]	$\times 2$	1.36M	53.30	27.8	39.231/0.9873
LFMamba [21]	$\times 2$	2.15M	92.29	75.9	39.424/0.9881
L^2 FMamba (Ours)	$\times 2$	1.04M	36.59	31.9	39.485/0.9873

Method	Scale	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Time(ms)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
LFSSR [27]	$\times 4$	1.61M	128.44	37.7	31.517/0.9370
MEG-Net [29]	$\times 4$	1.77M	102.20	32.4	31.717/0.9399
LFSSR_SAV [32]	$\times 4$	1.54M	99.15	43.2	32.189/0.9439
LF-ATO [28]	$\times 4$	1.66M	686.99	88.7	31.542/0.9373
LF-IINet [30]	$\times 4$	4.89M	57.42	20.8	32.060/0.9429
DistgSSR [4]	$\times 4$	3.58M	65.41	25.0	32.116/0.9439
HLFSSR-SSR [31]	$\times 4$	13.87M	182.93	32.7	32.285/0.9456
LFT [7]	$\times 4$	1.16M	57.60	95.2	32.268/0.9445
DPT [6]	$\times 4$	3.78M	66.55	99.7	31.932/0.9414
EPIT [8]	$\times 4$	1.47M	71.15	33.6	32.416/0.9452
LF-DET [9]	$\times 4$	1.69M	51.20	75.0	32.480/0.9463
MLFSR [22]	$\times 4$	1.41M	54.74	28.9	32.389/0.9235
LFMamba [21]	$\times 4$	2.30M	96.24	77.1	32.620/0.9471
L^2 FMamba (Ours)	$\times 4$	1.09M	37.99	32.6	32.623/0.9468

complexity by 25% compared to LF-DET, and improves inference speed by 40%-50%. These comparative experiments clearly demonstrate that L^2 FMamba effectively addresses the inherent challenges of high computational complexity and memory consumption in Transformer architectures, while maintaining excellent performance in super-resolution.

C. Ablation Study

1) Effectiveness of Components: This section explores the effectiveness of different layers within LF-VSSM. We con-

ducted three sets of ablation experiments, each retaining only one specific layer. To prevent the number of parameters from influencing the results, we maintained a consistent 3-layer structure in each block. The specific configurations are shown in rows a), b), and c) of Table III.

Intra-SSM Layer: When only the Intra-SSM layer is used, it primarily extracts spatial information from LF images while completely ignoring angular information, effectively reducing the task to a standard SISR problem. The results in row a) are similar to those of RCAN, further validating the spatial

TABLE III
ABLATION STUDY ON DIFFERENT COMPONENTS FOR $4\times$ LFSR.

Index	First	Second	Thrid	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
a)	Intra-SSM	Intra-SSM	Intra-SSM	1.094M	38.105	30.407/0.9147
b)	Inter-SSM	Inter-SSM	Inter-SSM	1.086M	37.928	31.196/0.9334
c)	MacPI-SSM	MacPI-SSM	MacPI-SSM	1.086M	37.928	32.546/0.9462
d)	Intra-SSM	Intra-SSM	MacPI-SSM	1.091M	38.046	32.503/0.9462
e)	Intra-SSM	MacPI-SSM	MacPI-SSM	1.088M	37.987	32.569/0.9463
f)	MacPI-SSM	Inter-SSM	Intra-SSM	1.088M	37.987	32.490/0.9462
Our	Intra-SSM	Inter-SSM	MacPI-SSM	1.088M	37.987	32.623/0.9468

TABLE IV
ABLATION STUDY ON DIFFERENT D_STATE (D) AND SSMRATIO (R)
FOR $4\times$ LFSR.

D	R	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
8	1.0	1.015M	31.065	32.438/0.9452
8	2.0	1.271M	42.627	32.526/0.9461
16	1.0	1.088M	37.987	32.623/0.9468
16	2.0	1.490M	56.599	32.720/0.9476

feature extraction capability of the Intra-SSM layer.

Inter-SSM Layer: The results in row b) show a slight improvement over row a), indicating the utilization of the angular information between SAIs. However, the focus remains on spatial information extraction, aligning with our design approach. Thus, while the Inter-SSM layer contributes to angular information extraction, it does not fully exploit it without the support of other layers.

MacPI-SSM Layer: The results of using only the MacPI-SSM layer in row c) show a significant improvement compared to rows a) and b), even surpassing advanced methods like LFD-DET in terms of effectiveness. Thus, the MacPI-SSM layer can effectively extract long-range spatial-angular contextual dependencies from light field images. However, there is still a 0.1 dB gap compared to our proposed LF-VSSM, further validates the effectiveness of our progressive spatial-angular feature extraction approach.

2) Effectiveness of progressive features extraction: To validate the effectiveness of the proposed progressive feature extraction method, three ablation experiments, as shown in rows d), e), and f) of Table III, are designed. In experiments d) and e), we removed the Inter-SSM layer and replaced it with Intra-SSM and MacPI-SSM, respectively, to assess the contribution of angular information between SAIs to performance. In experiment f), we altered the order of progressive feature extraction to examine the impact of the order on the results. The results show that the performance of these three experiments is inferior to the original method, demonstrating the critical importance of progressive spatial-angular feature extraction for the LFSR task. Additionally, the results of experiment e) are superior to those of experiment c), further validating the benefits of the progressive spatial-angular feature extraction strategy.

3) Position Embedding: We conducted three sets of ablation experiments related to positional encoding to explore its impact on model performance, as shown in Table V. In the

TABLE V
ABLATION STUDY ON POSITION EMBEDDING FOR $4\times$ LFSR.

	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
w/o P_{ang}	1.087M	37.987	32.503/0.9457
w/ P_{spa}^{fix}	1.154M	37.987	32.608/0.9467
w/ P_{spa}^{able}	1.154M	37.987	32.615/0.9468
L^2 FMamba	1.088M	37.987	32.623/0.9468

TABLE VI
ABLATION STUDY ON DIFFERENT LF-VSSM BLOCKS (K) FOR $4\times$ LFSR.

K	Params.	FLOPs(G)	Avg. PSNR/SSIM
2	0.634M	21.373G	32.017/0.9419
4	1.088M	37.987G	32.623/0.9468
6	1.543M	54.600G	32.700/0.9476
8	1.998M	71.214G	32.754/0.9483

w/o P_{ang} experiments, we removed the angular positional encoding, which resulted in a significant performance drop (-0.121 dB), clearly demonstrating the importance of angular positional encoding. Building on the addition of angular positional encoding, we further introduced two types of spatial positional embeddings: w/ P_{spa}^{fix} with fixed sine/cosine positional encoding and w/ P_{spa}^{able} with learnable spatial positional encoding. We found that w/ P_{spa}^{able} performed slightly better than w/ P_{spa}^{fix} , but the impact on the final results was minimal. This finding supports the conclusion that the scanning path design in SSM already provides sufficient spatial positional information.

Additionally, we conducted a visual analysis on the P_{ang} during training. We specifically selected the 1st, 30th, and 60th epochs, as they effectively capture the evolution of the P_{ang} throughout the training process. The 1st epoch shows the initial random state, while the 30th epoch reflects the early increase in encoding similarity. After the 60th epoch, we observe that the changes of the P_{ang} stabilize, indicating that the model has learned a stable geometric structure, with no significant changes thereafter. We computed the cosine similarity between the angular embeddings at the upper-left, upper-right, center, lower-left, and lower-right positions and those at other locations, and visualized the results as heatmaps, as shown in Fig. 5. From the heatmap, it is




Fig. 5. Heatmap of similarity between angular embeddings at top-left, bottom-left, center, bottom-right, top-right positions and other angular embeddings across different training epochs. Red boxes indicate anchors in the heatmap, Numbers represent the similarity between anchors and angular embeddings.

evident that as training progresses, the similarity between P_{ang} increases, gradually aligning with the geometric structure of the LF angular distribution. This progression demonstrates that the model has successfully captured the spatial relationships between different viewpoints. This transformation provides robust prior knowledge for subsequent feature extraction and further highlights the crucial role of angular positional encoding in enhancing model performance.

4) SSM Parameters: The d_{state} and $ssm-ratio$ are critical parameters in SSM. We conducted a series of ablation experiments to explore their impact on $L^2FMamba$, with the results presented in Table IV. The experimental results indicate that d_{state} has a more significant influence on LFSR task performance, likely because a higher d_{state} enables the model to capture and represent more complex dynamic information. Conversely, $ssm-ratio$ primarily affects the parameter count and computational complexity. To achieve an optimal balance between performance and efficiency, we set the d_{state} to 8 and the $ssm-ratio$ to 1.0 as the default configuration for $L^2FMamba$.

5) Number of LF-VSSM Blocks: Finally, we investigated the impact of the number of LF-VSSM blocks on LFSR task performance, as shown in Table VI. The results demonstrate that $L^2FMamba$ can enhance expressive capability and performance by increasing the number of LF-VSSM blocks, demonstrating its good scalability. However, as the number of

blocks increases, the computational parameters and complexity also rise significantly. Therefore, we ultimately select 4 LF-VSSM blocks in $L^2FMamba$.

V. CONCLUSION

This study first introduces the LF-VSSM block for the LFSR task. Based on the principle of progressive feature extraction, it successively captures critical long-range spatial-angular context dependencies within LF images across spatial and angular dimensions, significantly enhancing the performance of LFSR tasks. On this basis, we propose a lightweight network, $L^2FMamba$, which integrates the LF-VSSM block. $L^2FMamba$ effectively reduces the number of parameters and computational costs while achieving state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance. Extensive experimental results on five common LF datasets demonstrate that our method achieves SOTA results for $2\times$ and $4\times$ LFSR tasks, further validating the effectiveness, efficiency, and scalability of the proposed network.

However, despite the significant progress made by $L^2FMamba$ in the LFSR task, there are still some limitations. The method shows insufficient detail recovery when handling large disparity variations, and the reconstruction of fine structures at high magnification is suboptimal. Future research could enhance robustness and recovery capability by incorporating multi-level feature fusion and optimizing the structure of the lightweight network.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. S. Jayaweera, C. U. Edussooriya, C. Wijenayake, P. Agathoklis, and L. T. Bruton, "Multi-volumetric refocusing of light fields," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 31–35, 2020.
- [2] Y. Zhang, H. Lv, Y. Liu, H. Wang, X. Wang, Q. Huang, X. Xiang, and Q. Dai, "Light-field depth estimation via epipolar plane image analysis and locally linear embedding," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 739–747, 2016.
- [3] L. F. Hodges, "Stereoscopic display," in *Electro-Optical Displays*. CRC Press, 2020, pp. 291–310.
- [4] Y. Wang, L. Wang, G. Wu, J. Yang, W. An, J. Yu, and Y. Guo, "Disentangling light fields for super-resolution and disparity estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 425–443, 2022.
- [5] V. Van Duong, T. N. Huu, J. Yim, and B. Jeon, "Light field image super-resolution network via joint spatial-angular and epipolar information," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging*, vol. 9, pp. 350–366, 2023.
- [6] S. Wang, T. Zhou, Y. Lu, and H. Di, "Detail-preserving transformer for light field image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2022, pp. 2522–2530.
- [7] Z. Liang, Y. Wang, L. Wang, J. Yang, and S. Zhou, "Light field image super-resolution with transformers," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 29, pp. 563–567, 2022.
- [8] Z. Liang, Y. Wang, L. Wang, J. Yang, S. Zhou, and Y. Guo, "Learning non-local spatial-angular correlation for light field image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2023, pp. 12376–12386.
- [9] R. Cong, H. Sheng, D. Yang, Z. Cui, and R. Chen, "Exploiting spatial and angular correlations with deep efficient transformers for light field image super-resolution," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023.
- [10] Z. Z. Hu, X. Chen, V. Y. Y. Chung, and Y. Shen, "Beyond subspace isolation: many-to-many transformer for light field image super-resolution," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2024.
- [11] Z. Chen and E. N. Brown, "State space model," *Scholarpedia*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 30868, 2013.
- [12] A. Gu and T. Dao, "Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- [13] H. Chen, F. Shao, X. Chai, and H. Chen, "Progressive spatial-angular feature enhancement network for light field image super-resolution," *Displays*, vol. 79, p. 102501, 2023.
- [14] G. Liu, H. Yue, and J. Yang, "Efficient light field image super-resolution via progressive disentangling," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, June 2024, pp. 6277–6286.
- [15] Y. Yoon, H.-G. Jeon, D. Yoo, J.-Y. Lee, and I. So Kweon, "Learning a deep convolutional network for light-field image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*, 2015, pp. 24–32.
- [16] Y. Wang, L. Wang, J. Yang, W. An, J. Yu, and Y. Guo, "Spatial-angular interaction for light field image super-resolution," in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXIII 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 290–308.
- [17] L. Zhu, B. Liao, Q. Zhang, X. Wang, W. Liu, and X. Wang, "Vision mamba: Efficient visual representation learning with bidirectional state space model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09417*, 2024.
- [18] Y. Liu, Y. Tian, Y. Zhao, H. Yu, L. Xie, Y. Wang, Q. Ye, and Y. Liu, "Vmamba: Visual state space model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10166*, 2024.
- [19] H. Guo, J. Li, T. Dai, Z. Ouyang, X. Ren, and S.-T. Xia, "Mambair: A simple baseline for image restoration with state-space model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15648*, 2024.
- [20] X. Lei, W. ZHANG, and W. Cao, "Dvmsr: Distilled vision mamba for efficient super-resolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03008*, 2024.
- [21] W. xia, Y. Lu, S. Wang, Z. Wang, P. Xia, and T. Zhou, "Lfmamba: Light field image super-resolution with state space model," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12463>
- [22] R. Gao, Z. Xiao, and Z. Xiong, "Mamba-based light field super-resolution with efficient subspace scanning," in *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision (ACCV)*, December 2024, pp. 531–547.
- [23] Y. Li, K. Zhang, J. Cao, R. Timofte, and L. Van Gool, "Localvit: Bringing locality to vision transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05707*, 2021.
- [24] J. Yao, D. Hong, C. Li, and J. Chanussot, "Spectralmamba: Efficient mamba for hyperspectral image classification," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.08489>
- [25] Y. Zhang, K. Li, K. Li, L. Wang, B. Zhong, and Y. Fu, "Image super-resolution using very deep residual channel attention networks," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 286–301.
- [26] S. Zhang, Y. Lin, and H. Sheng, "Residual networks for light field image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 11046–11055.
- [27] H. W. F. Yeung, J. Hou, X. Chen, J. Chen, Z. Chen, and Y. Y. Chung, "Light field spatial super-resolution using deep efficient spatial-angular separable convolution," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 2319–2330, 2018.
- [28] J. Jin, J. Hou, J. Chen, and S. Kwong, "Light field spatial super-resolution via deep combinatorial geometry embedding and structural consistency regularization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 2260–2269.
- [29] S. Zhang, S. Chang, and Y. Lin, "End-to-end light field spatial super-resolution network using multiple epipolar geometry," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 5956–5968, 2021.
- [30] G. Liu, H. Yue, J. Wu, and J. Yang, "Intra-inter view interaction network for light field image super-resolution," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 25, pp. 256–266, 2021.
- [31] V. V. Duong, T. H. Nguyen, J. Yim, and B. Jeon, "Light field image super-resolution network via joint spatial-angular and epipolar information," *IEEE Trans. Computational Imaging*, 2023.
- [32] Z. Cheng, Y. Liu, and Z. Xiong, "Spatial-angular versatile convolution for light field reconstruction," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging*, vol. 8, pp. 1131–1144, 2022.
- [33] J. Jin, J. Hou, J. Chen, H. Zeng, S. Kwong, and J. Yu, "Deep coarse-to-fine dense light field reconstruction with flexible sampling and geometry-aware fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 1819–1836, 2020.
- [34] Y. Wang, J. Yang, L. Wang, X. Ying, T. Wu, W. An, and Y. Guo, "Light field image super-resolution using deformable convolution," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 1057–1071, 2020.
- [35] M. Rerabek and T. Ebrahimi, "New light field image dataset," in *8th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*, 2016.
- [36] M. Le Pendu, X. Jiang, and C. Guillemot, "Light field inpainting propagation via low rank matrix completion," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 1981–1993, 2018.
- [37] V. Vaish and A. Adams, "The (new) stanford light field archive," *Computer Graphics Laboratory, Stanford University*, vol. 6, no. 7, p. 3, 2008.
- [38] S. Wanner, S. Meister, and B. Goldluecke, "Datasets and benchmarks for densely sampled 4d light fields," in *VMV*, vol. 13, 2013, pp. 225–226.
- [39] K. Honauer, O. Johannsen, D. Kondermann, and B. Goldluecke, "A dataset and evaluation methodology for depth estimation on 4d light fields," in *Computer Vision—ACCV 2016: 13th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Taipei, Taiwan, November 20–24, 2016, Revised Selected Papers, Part III 13*. Springer, 2017, pp. 19–34.