

DeCompress: Denoising via Neural Compression

Ali Zafari*, Xi Chen*, Shirin Jalali

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Rutgers University

Piscataway, NJ, USA

Email: {ali.zafari, xi.chen15, shirin.jalali}@rutgers.edu

Abstract—Learning-based denoising algorithms achieve state-of-the-art performance across various denoising tasks. However, training such models relies on access to large training datasets consisting of clean and noisy image pairs. On the other hand, in many imaging applications, such as microscopy, collecting ground truth images is often infeasible. To address this challenge, researchers have recently developed algorithms that can be trained without requiring access to ground truth data. However, training such models remains computationally challenging and still requires access to large noisy training samples. In this work, inspired by compression-based denoising and recent advances in neural compression, we propose a new compression-based denoising algorithm, which we name DeCompress, that i) does not require access to ground truth images, ii) does not require access to large training dataset - only a single noisy image is sufficient, iii) is robust to overfitting, and iv) achieves superior performance compared with zero-shot or unsupervised learning-based denoisers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Image denoising studies the problem of recovering image $X^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ from noisy measurements $Y^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where

$$Y^n = X^n + Z^n; \quad Z^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I),$$

At the core of all image denoising algorithms lies a method to leverage the inherent structure of the source. Classical denoising algorithms relied on handcrafted features identified by domain experts [1]–[6]. Recently, the effectiveness of deep learning methods in capturing complex source structure from training data has led researchers to develop various learning-based denoisers [7]–[11]. Although these methods achieve state-of-the-art performance on a benchmark datasets, they still face limitations, such as reliability concerns. Additionally, learning-based methods typically require extensive training datasets consisting of clean and noisy image pairs. In many practical imaging applications in remote sensing [12], microscopy [13] and astronomical imaging [14], however, not only is the availability of training images limited, but obtaining ground truth images is often impossible.

To address some of these limitations, recent studies have introduced denoising algorithms that can be trained exclusively on noisy images without requiring access to paired noisy and clean images [15]–[19]. However, such methods still require access to large training datasets, and their performance is suboptimal compared to methods that have access to clean images. Furthermore, due to the complexity of the neural net

structures required in the absence of clean images, training such models often is challenging.

The challenges with existing learning-based methods highlight the need to explore alternative approaches. Compression algorithms provide one such alternative direction. The goal of a compression code is to efficiently represent signals by leveraging their underlying structure, similar to denoising algorithms. Consider lossy compression of a noisy signal $Y^n = X^n + Z^n$ at a distortion level proportional to the variance of the additive noise Z^n . In this scenario, the clean signal X^n emerges as a strong candidate for reconstructing Y^n due to its inherent structured nature, enabling efficient representation. This intuitive connection between denoising and compression, which naturally leads to a compression-based denoising approach, has been formally established in the literature [20], [21]. Despite the theoretical foundations supporting compression-based denoising, its practical application beyond finite-alphabet sources has remained limited.

Joint optimization of the parameters of an autoencoder while constraining the rate of its bottleneck [22], coined as neural compression, has gained a lot of attention in recent year. It has led to development of learning-based lossy data compression methods [23] for general sources by only having access to their samples. Since then, learning-based neural compression algorithms have advanced to outperform traditional hand-engineered compression schemes for high dimensional data such as images [24]–[26], in terms of rate-distortion performance. The superior rate-distortion performance of neural lossy image compression, coupled with its learning-based nature, motivates the following question:

Can we employ neural lossy compression codes to develop efficient image denoising algorithms?

To optimize the performance of compression-based denoising, it is crucial to adjust the compression code’s operating point according to the noise characteristics. In our proposed neural compression-based denoiser, this adjustment is achieved by tuning the Lagrangian coefficient associated with the rate term. Unlike other learning-based methods such as Noise2Noise [16], Noise2Void [17], Noise2Self [18], and Noise2Score [19], which require either multiple noisy versions of the same image or extensive noisy image datasets for training, our proposed neural compression-based denoiser eliminates the need for both. Instead, our method can effectively train on a very limited number—or even a single—noisy image.

*Equal contribution.

Paper organization. Section II reviews the related work in the literature. Section III gives an overview of the idea of compression-based denoising and then presents our proposed neural compression-based denoiser. Section IV presents our experimental results. Finally, Section V concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORKS

Compression-based denoising is a well-established theoretically founded approach for denoising [20], [21]. Given the extensive development of lossy compression algorithms, various compression-based denoising algorithms have been proposed in the literature [27]–[30]. For instance, [27] employs the Minimum Description Length principle to select the best wavelet coefficients that balance the rate and distortion for denoising the image. Similarly, Natarajan [28] proposes the Occam filter which provides lossy compression of the source, with the distortion level heuristically selected proportional to the noise level. Chang et al. [29], [30] employ optimal soft-thresholding of wavelet coefficients, where the optimized threshold value is claimed to be analogous to the zero-zone in quantizer. However, while compression-based denoising algorithms have shown to achieve near-optimal performance in denoising some finite, one-dimensional stationary sources [31], their performance in image denoising remains sub-optimal compared to other denoising methods.

Data compression, particularly image compression, is a mature research area with over 60 years of history. Recently, the success of deep learning in various machine learning tasks has spurred interest in developing DL-based compression methods. Neural compression networks, introduced as a learning-based approach, have demonstrated superior rate-distortion performance in image compression [23]–[26]. Moreover, in recent years there has also been progress in theoretically understanding the capacity and limitations of neural compression codes. For instance, Wagner et al. [32] show that a neural compression network can achieve the fundamental rate-distortion limits for a simple stochastic source with a one-dimensional latent space. However, Bhadane et al. [33] find that this optimal performance does not easily extend to sources with a two-dimensional manifold structure. Ozyilkcan et al. [34] highlight the challenges neural networks face in achieving optimal compression when trained on sources with inherent discontinuities. To address this, they propose enhancing neural compression networks by providing Fourier features as input, a technique similar to those used in learning implicit neural representations [35].

In this paper, we aim to develop an image denoising algorithm using neural compression networks. A related but fundamentally distinct problem is using these networks to compress noisy images more efficiently, which has a different objective than ours. Compressing noisy images typically requires a higher bit rate, especially when using neural compression models trained on clean images. Therefore, to compress noisy images more efficiently, [36] propose adding convolutional layers in the decoder, inspired by DnCNN [7], enabling simultaneous compression and denoising while reducing computational costs at the expense of rate-distortion trade-offs. [37] improve upon




Fig. 1. Structure of the neural compression network used for denoising. *Conv* represents convolutional layer, and *GDN* is the activation function. More details on the structure of network can be found in Section IV-C.

this by introducing noise level estimation in the latent space, utilizing a two-branch network trained with a distance penalty to allocate fewer bits for noisy images. [38] extend this further by incorporating contrastive loss to better align noisy and clean latent codes. Similarly, [39] partition the latent code to facilitate separate noisy and clean reconstructions, while [40] investigate training neural compression models directly on noisy images to enhance rate-distortion performance compared to models trained solely on clean data.

III. LOSSY NEURAL CODES FOR DENOISING

A. Compression-based denoising

Denoising algorithms leverage the source structure to differentiate between noise and signal. Image denoising algorithms leverage well-known image structures, such as sparsity in wavelet domain or smoothness, to achieve this goal. Similarly, data compression algorithms employ the same structures to provide efficient image representation. Given that at their core, both methods utilize the source structure, one might ask: Given an efficient compression algorithm, can we design an efficient denoising algorithm, that instead of directly dealing with the source structure, employs the compression code to enforce the source model?

The answer to this question has been shown to be affirmative. Donoho [20] introduced the concept of minimum Kolmogorov complexity estimator connecting optimal lossy compression and denoising. This result was later refined in [21] using rate-distortion codes. The authors showed that compressing a noisy process with a family of compression codes that achieves the rate-distortion curve of the noisy process, operating at a distortion level matching the noise level, the joint empirical distribution of the noisy signal and its compressed version converges to the joint distribution of the noisy signal and the source. This result suggests that with additional post-processing, one can achieve optimal denoising performance [21] using compression codes.

Despite a solid theoretical foundation, success of compression-based methods in denoising high-dimensional real-valued signals such as images, has been limited. Inspired by neural compression codes and their ability to learn the source distribution from training samples, in the next section we propose a denoising algorithm based on neural compression.

B. Neural Compression as Denoiser

Neural image compression algorithms employ an end-to-end trainable neural network to optimize a set of parameters for both the analysis and synthesis nonlinear transforms. Figure 1



Fig. 2. Eleven test images, with resolutions of 256×256 for images 1-7 and 512×512 for image 8-11.

TABLE I

DENOISING PERFORMANCE COMPARISON (PSNR) OF THE TEST IMAGES IN FIGURE 2 UNDER ADDITIVE GAUSSIAN NOISE $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$. DeCOMPRESS (SINGLE) DENOTES TRAINING OUR MODEL ON A SINGLE NOISY IMAGE FOR DENOISING, DeCOMPRESS (BSD400) DENOTES TRAINING OUR MODEL ON NOISY VERSION OF IMAGES IN THE BSD400 DATASET.

σ	Method	256 × 256							512 × 512				Average
		C.man	House	Peppers	Starfish	Monarch	Airplane	Parrot	Barbara	Boats	Pirate	Couple	
15	BM3D	31.91	34.93	32.69	31.14	31.85	31.07	31.37	33.10	32.13	31.92	32.10	32.20
	JPEG2K	27.14	29.22	27.86	26.63	26.77	26.61	27.14	26.78	27.97	27.78	27.44	27.39
	Deep Decoder	26.85	30.96	25.79	28.38	28.47	25.33	27.40	24.31	28.27	28.87	27.79	27.49
	Noise2Void	25.68	30.05	26.60	26.41	27.34	24.38	26.41	24.36	28.73	27.33	28.36	26.88
	DeCompress (single)	28.68	32.81	30.89	29.41	30.01	28.24	28.16	25.94	30.94	30.74	30.56	29.67
	DeCompress (BSD400)	29.09	33.56	31.09	30.42	31.16	29.00	28.97	25.75	30.94	31.00	30.63	30.15
25	BM3D	29.45	32.86	30.16	28.56	29.09	28.42	28.93	30.71	29.90	29.61	29.71	29.76
	JPEG2K	24.51	27.30	24.85	24.20	24.04	23.88	24.58	24.08	25.56	25.74	25.28	24.91
	Deep Decoder	25.06	28.77	24.39	26.16	26.22	23.84	25.44	23.57	26.46	27.10	26.08	25.74
	Noise2Void	23.19	27.86	24.48	23.97	25.22	22.60	23.86	22.87	26.62	25.61	26.19	24.77
	DeCompress (single)	26.56	30.28	27.90	26.36	27.30	26.00	26.20	24.65	28.33	28.22	27.81	27.24
	DeCompress (BSD400)	26.76	31.09	28.23	27.20	28.13	26.64	26.72	24.38	28.38	28.50	28.01	27.64
50	BM3D	26.13	29.69	26.68	25.04	25.82	25.10	25.90	27.22	26.78	26.81	26.46	26.51
	JPEG2K	21.44	24.38	21.71	21.38	20.80	21.16	21.22	21.73	22.87	23.34	22.70	22.07
	Deep Decoder	22.80	25.98	22.60	23.30	23.12	21.10	22.52	22.60	24.07	24.73	23.93	23.34
	Noise2Void	17.99	22.69	20.20	18.72	19.40	19.20	17.64	19.57	21.48	20.45	21.31	19.88
	DeCompress (single)	23.95	26.88	24.56	23.30	23.91	23.23	23.16	23.12	25.52	25.78	25.08	24.41
	DeCompress (BSD400)	24.15	27.89	25.18	23.94	24.58	23.76	24.18	23.18	25.67	26.07	25.34	24.90

shows the proposed neural compression-based denoiser, which receives the noisy signal Y^n as input and generates the denoised signal \hat{Y}^n as output. In this model, g_a and g_s represent the analysis and synthesis transforms, respectively. To train this model, one only requires access to noisy images. The distinction between this model and typical denoising neural nets, such as DnCNN [7], is that during training the goal is not to recover the clean image. Instead, here, at the training stage, the loss is measured between the input noisy and its reconstruction \hat{Y}^n . However, unlike other learning-based methods that do not have access to the clean and noisy image pairs [16], [17], [19], here, due to the regularization done by the compression code, the network does not overfit to learn an identity map.

In the neural compression network shown in Figure 1, the entropy model is a nonparametric density estimation model, which is trained to fit the distribution of the latent code representation of the image [25]. Let $\lfloor C^m \rfloor$ denote the quantized latent code shown in Figure 1. The bottleneck's rate is defined as

$$R = \mathbb{E}[-\log_2 \mathbb{P}(\lfloor C^m \rfloor)],$$

where C^m represents the output of the analysis transform, i.e., $C^m = g_a(Y^n)$ and the expectation is computed with respect to the input source Y^n . The quantized representation is then mapped to the image domain using a synthesis transform as

$\hat{Y}^n = g_s(\lfloor C^m \rfloor)$. The rate distortion loss function is then employed as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{Y}^n - Y^n\|_2^2\right] + \lambda R, \quad (1)$$

with the Lagrangian multiplier λ determining the point on the achievable rate-distortion region.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

We compare our method for denoising against the representative denoiser baselines: 1) BM3D [41], block-matching based on non-local similarity and 3D filtering; 2) Deep Decoder [42], denoising by regularization from the network's structure; 3) JPEG2K wavelet thresholding [29], [30], employing JPEG-2000 lossy compression algorithm to denoise via wavelet thresholding; 4) Noise2Void [17], a learning based method which only requires access to a dataset of noisy images. The common point among the learning-based baselines is that no pairs of noisy and clean data are needed in the learning phase of the denoisers. The first three approaches are zero-shot, i.e., only the noisy image to be denoised is required, while the last baseline (Noise2Void) requires a large training dataset of noisy images. To explore the performance of the proposed neural compression-based denoising, which we name it as *DeCompress*, we study two training settings. Specifically, we train two networks, using 1) a set of noisy images and 2) a

single noisy image. We compare the denoising performance on the clean images shown in Figure 2 under different levels of additive noise.

We numerically compared our two denoisers with others in Table I using PSNR between the denoised image and its ground-truth, and visually in Figure 4. There are several interesting findings: 1) When the noise level is set correctly in BM3D, the denoising performance is very good that can be used as a good reference for evaluating learning-based denoisers. 2) JPEG2K can be considered as an effective baseline of wavelet thresholding for denoising. 3) Noise2Void’s denoising performance is not satisfactory even when trained on a set of noisy images. 4) Our method, neural compression code for denoising, does not rely considerably on the size of training dataset, and even a single noisy image is sufficient for the networks to learn a compression code with competitive denoising performance. In the following, we further study different aspects of the neural compression-based denoising.

A. Training on one vs. many noisy images

As shown in Table I, increasing the training data size from a single image to 400 images does not significantly enhance the performance of our compression-based denoisers. This observation aligns with previous studies on neural compression networks [43], [44]. For instance, unlike the generative models, Minnen et al. [43] observed that reconstructed images of random samples of a trained entropy model exhibit significant local structure. Likewise, Zhu et al. [44] found that, in contrast to the typical behavior of vision transformers, which capture global representations, their transformer-based neural compression models reconstruct each pixel based on only a small region of the input image. They attribute this phenomenon to the rate term, which regularizes the network to focus on local patches during reconstruction. These findings support the idea that the denoising performance of our networks remains largely unaffected by the size of the training dataset and that the training process is unlikely to overfit to a single image.

B. Relationship between λ and σ ?

We use coefficient λ to control the entropy rate of the neural compression code, which directly determines the distortion level as well. As discussed in Section III, the rate-distortion operating point of the compression code should be selected as a function of the noise level. For instance, the author in [28] states that “when the loss level is equal to the true underlying noise level, optimal lossy compression of random process data must exhibit reconstructions which look like samples from the correct Bayesian posterior.” Consistently, in our implementations, we use larger λ for higher additive noise level. However, the selection of hyperparameter λ relies on a good estimation of the noise level, and the networks with different λ need to be trained separately for different noise levels. Adaptively selecting λ as a function of the noisy image and exploring the possibility of efficiently training compression networks that generalize across different noise levels or the usage of



Fig. 3. The image randomly selected from ImageNet-1k used for training our neural compression (*ILSVRC2012_val_00000059.jpeg*, 500×375 pixels).

variable-rate neural compression networks [22], [45], is also an interesting question for future research.

C. Experimental settings

a) *Neural compression denoisers*: We use the network architecture by Ballé et al. [25] with the Factorized Prior as the entropy model. Our network as shown in Figure 1 consists of three convolutional layers for both the analysis and synthesis networks, each downsizing and upsizing the spatial dimensions by a two at each layer, respectively. The first two convolutional layers in analysis have 256 channels while the last one has 16. All the convolutional layers use a kernel size of 3 with stride 2. Lagrangian multiplier of the rate term in loss function (Equation 1) is set to $\lambda = 300, 1000, 3000$ for noise levels $\sigma = 15, 25, 50$, respectively. The activation function applied to the convolutional layer outputs is Generalized Divisive Normalization (GDN) [24]. Additionally, to avoid zero gradient caused by quantization of the bottleneck during updating parameters of both the analysis network and the entropy model, we use the similar approach proposed by Ballé et al. [24] to approximate the quantization, i.e., adding uniform distributed noise $u \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ to the bottleneck C^m during training, and rounding to the nearest integer at evaluation. We use Adam optimizer with learning rate of 2×10^{-4} utilizing the neural compression networks implementations provided by the CompressAI [46] package.

b) *Data preparation*: We choose two different datasets to train the neural compression network. First, we use overlapping patches extracted from the image shown in Figure 3. Second, we use the common dataset in learning-based denoising algorithms, BSD400 [47] consisting of 400 grayscale images of size 180×180 . In all our experiments with neural compression, we set the input patch size to 16×16 with stride step to be 1 both in training and evaluation. During the evaluation, we denoise overlapping patches of size 16×16 of the test image, and then take their average with respect to their location to find the overall denoised image.




Fig. 4. Visual comparison of denoising methods in Table I for Monarch image at noise level $\sigma = 25$. The PSNR (dB) is above each denoised image.

c) *Baseline settings*: The setups for the other denoising algorithms are as follows: For BM3D, the noise level parameter is set equal to the noise level, i.e., σ , in the test noisy image. For Deep Decoder, we train the network for 5000 iterations and calculate the PSNR values with respect to the clean image, reporting the best achieved PSNR in Table I. For JPEG2K wavelet thresholding [29], we use the JPEG-2000 implementation from `OpenCV`. The values reported in Table I are obtained by sweeping over the rate parameter of the JPEG-2000 compression algorithm and selecting the best PSNR achieved with respect to the clean image. For Noise2Void, we use the official implementation provided in the `CAREamics*` package. To ensure a fair comparison, we train the Noise2Void networks separately for each noise level from scratch on BSD400, applying data augmentation as described in the original paper [17].

V. CONCLUSION

Inspired by the well-established theoretical connection between optimal lossy compression and denoising, we propose neural compression-based image denoising method. Our experimental results show that a neural network optimized with rate-distortion loss over a dataset of noisy image(s) is capable of delivering competitive denoising performance to zero-shot learning-based denoising methods.

Over the past decade, compression-based algorithms have been studied, both theoretically and algorithmically, for a range

of inverse problems beyond denoising [48]–[51]. Algorithmically exploring application of neural compression techniques in solving these inverse problems is an intriguing and promising direction for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A.Z., X.C., S.J. were supported by NSF CCF-2237538.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Mallat, *A wavelet tour of signal processing*. Elsevier, 1999.
- [2] D. L. Donoho, “De-noising by soft-thresholding,” *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 613–627, 2002.
- [3] J. Portilla, V. Strela, M. J. Wainwright, and E. P. Simoncelli, “Image denoising using scale mixtures of gaussians in the wavelet domain,” *IEEE Transactions on Image processing*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1338–1351, 2003.
- [4] M. Elad and M. Aharon, “Image denoising via sparse and redundant representations over learned dictionaries,” *IEEE Transactions on Image processing*, vol. 15, no. 12, pp. 3736–3745, 2006.
- [5] S. Roth and M. J. Black, “Fields of experts,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 82, pp. 205–229, 2009.
- [6] S. Gu, L. Zhang, W. Zuo, and X. Feng, “Weighted nuclear norm minimization with application to image denoising,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2014, pp. 2862–2869.
- [7] K. Zhang, W. Zuo, Y. Chen, D. Meng, and L. Zhang, “Beyond a gaussian denoiser: Residual learning of deep cnn for image denoising,” *IEEE transactions on image processing*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 3142–3155, 2017.
- [8] K. Zhang, W. Zuo, and L. Zhang, “Ffdnet: Toward a fast and flexible solution for cnn-based image denoising,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 4608–4622, 2018.
- [9] S. Lefkimmiatis, “Universal denoising networks: a novel cnn architecture for image denoising,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 3204–3213.
- [10] Y. Zhang, Y. Tian, Y. Kong, B. Zhong, and Y. Fu, “Residual dense network for image restoration,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 2480–2495, 2020.

*<https://careamics.github.io/0.1/>

- [11] J. Liang, J. Cao, G. Sun, K. Zhang, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte, "Swinir: Image restoration using swin transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 1833–1844.
- [12] A. Safonova, G. Ghazaryan, S. Stiller, M. Main-Knorn, C. Nendel, and M. Ryo, "Ten deep learning techniques to address small data problems with remote sensing," *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, vol. 125, p. 103569, 2023.
- [13] C. Belthangady and L. A. Royer, "Applications, promises, and pitfalls of deep learning for fluorescence image reconstruction," *Nature methods*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 1215–1225, 2019.
- [14] D. Baron, "Machine learning in astronomy: A practical overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07248*, 2019.
- [15] S. Soltanayev and S. Y. Chun, "Training deep learning based denoisers without ground truth data," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [16] J. Lehtinen, J. Munkberg, J. Hasselgren, S. Laine, T. Karras, M. Aittala, and T. Aila, "Noise2noise: Learning image restoration without clean data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.04189*, 2018.
- [17] A. Krull, T.-O. Buchholz, and F. Jug, "Noise2void-learning denoising from single noisy images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 2129–2137.
- [18] J. Batson and L. Royer, "Noise2self: Blind denoising by self-supervision," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 524–533.
- [19] K. Kim and J. C. Ye, "Noise2score: tweedie's approach to self-supervised image denoising without clean images," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 864–874, 2021.
- [20] D. L. Donoho, *The kolmogorov sampler*. Department of Statistics, Stanford University, 2002.
- [21] T. Weissman and E. Ordentlich, "The empirical distribution of rate-constrained source codes," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 3718–3733, 2005.
- [22] J. Ballé, P. A. Chou, D. Minnen, S. Singh, N. Johnston, E. Agustsson, S. J. Hwang, and G. Toderici, "Nonlinear transform coding," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 339–353, 2020.
- [23] Y. Yang, S. Mandt, L. Theis *et al.*, "An introduction to neural data compression," *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 113–200, 2023.
- [24] J. Ballé, V. Laparra, and E. P. Simoncelli, "End-to-end optimized image compression," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [25] J. Ballé, D. Minnen, S. Singh, S. J. Hwang, and N. Johnston, "Variational image compression with a scale hyperprior," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [26] D. Minnen, J. Ballé, and G. D. Toderici, "Joint autoregressive and hierarchical priors for learned image compression," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [27] N. Saito, "Simultaneous noise suppression and signal compression using a library of orthonormal bases and the minimum description length criterion," in *Wavelet Analysis and Its Applications*. Elsevier, 1994, vol. 4, pp. 299–324.
- [28] B. K. Natarajan, "Filtering random noise from deterministic signals via data compression," *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, vol. 43, no. 11, pp. 2595–2605, 1995.
- [29] S. G. Chang, B. Yu, and M. Vetterli, "Image denoising via lossy compression and wavelet thresholding," in *Proceedings of International Conference on Image Processing*, vol. 1. IEEE, 1997, pp. 604–607.
- [30] —, "Adaptive wavelet thresholding for image denoising and compression," *IEEE transactions on image processing*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 1532–1546, 2000.
- [31] S. Jalali and T. Weissman, "Denoising via mcmc-based lossy compression," *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 3092–3100, 2012.
- [32] A. B. Wagner and J. Ballé, "Neural networks optimally compress the sawbridge," in *2021 Data Compression Conference (DCC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 143–152.
- [33] S. Bhadane, A. B. Wagner, and J. Ballé, "Do neural networks compress manifolds optimally?" in *2022 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 582–587.
- [34] E. Ozyilkan, J. Ballé, S. Bhadane, A. B. Wagner, and E. Erkip, "Breaking smoothness: The struggles of neural compressors with discontinuous mappings," in *Workshop on Machine Learning and Compression, NeurIPS 2024*, 2024.
- [35] V. Sitzmann, J. Martel, A. Bergman, D. Lindell, and G. Wetzstein, "Implicit neural representations with periodic activation functions," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 7462–7473, 2020.
- [36] M. Testolina, E. Upenik, and T. Ebrahimi, "Towards image denoising in the latent space of learning-based compression," in *Applications of Digital Image Processing XLIV*, vol. 11842. SPIE, 2021, pp. 412–422.
- [37] L. Larigauderie, M. Testolina, and T. Ebrahimi, "On combining denoising with learning-based image decoding," in *Applications of Digital Image Processing XLV*, vol. 12226. SPIE, 2022, pp. 193–206.
- [38] Y. Xie, L. Yu, F. Pakdaman, and M. Gabbouj, "Joint end-to-end image compression and denoising: Leveraging contrastive learning and multi-scale self-ombs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05582*, 2024.
- [39] S. Ranjbar Alvar, M. Ulhaq, H. Choi, and I. V. Bajić, "Joint image compression and denoising via latent-space scalability," *Frontiers in Signal Processing*, vol. 2, p. 932873, 2022.
- [40] B. Brummer and C. De Vleeschouwer, "On the importance of denoising when learning to compress images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 2440–2448.
- [41] K. Dabov, A. Foi, V. Katkovnik, and K. Egiazarian, "Image denoising by sparse 3-d transform-domain collaborative filtering," *IEEE Transactions on image processing*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 2080–2095, 2007.
- [42] R. Heckel and P. Hand, "Deep decoder: Concise image representations from untrained non-convolutional networks," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [43] D. Minnen and S. Singh, "Channel-wise autoregressive entropy models for learned image compression," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3339–3343.
- [44] Y. Zhu, Y. Yang, and T. Cohen, "Transformer-based transform coding," in *International conference on learning representations*, 2022.
- [45] Y. Choi, M. El-Khamy, and J. Lee, "Variable rate deep image compression with a conditional autoencoder," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 3146–3154.
- [46] J. Bégin, F. Racapé, S. Feltman, and A. Pushpajaja, "Compressai: a pytorch library and evaluation platform for end-to-end compression research," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03029*, 2020.
- [47] D. Martin, C. Fowlkes, D. Tal, and J. Malik, "A database of human segmented natural images and its application to evaluating segmentation algorithms and measuring ecological statistics," in *Proceedings eighth IEEE international conference on computer vision. ICCV 2001*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2001, pp. 416–423.
- [48] S. Jalali and A. Maleki, "From compression to compressed sensing," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 352–385, 2016.
- [49] F. E. Rezagah, S. Jalali, E. Erkip, and H. V. Poor, "Compression-based compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6735–6752, 2017.
- [50] Y. Dar, M. Elad, and A. M. Bruckstein, "Restoration by compression," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 22, pp. 5833–5847, 2018.
- [51] S. Beygi, S. Jalali, A. Maleki, and U. Mitra, "An efficient algorithm for compression-based compressed sensing," *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 343–375, 2019.