

NCAP: Scene Text Image Super-Resolution with Non-Categorical Prior

Dongwoo Park and SUK PIL KO
THINKWARE Corporation, Republic of Korea
{infinity7428, spko}@thinkware.co.kr

Abstract

Scene text image super-resolution (STISR) enhances the resolution and quality of low-resolution images. Unlike previous studies that treated scene text images as natural images, recent methods using a text prior (TP), extracted from a pre-trained text recognizer, have shown strong performance. However, two major issues emerge: (1) Explicit categorical priors, like TP, can negatively impact STISR if incorrect. We reveal that these explicit priors are unstable and propose replacing them with Non-Categorical Prior (NCAP) using penultimate layer representations. (2) Pre-trained recognizers used to generate TP struggle with low-resolution images. To address this, most studies jointly train the recognizer with the STISR network to bridge the domain gap between low- and high-resolution images, but this can cause an overconfidence phenomenon in the prior modality. We highlight this issue and propose a method to mitigate it by mixing hard and soft labels. Experiments on the TextZoom dataset demonstrate an improvement by 3.5%, while our method significantly enhances generalization performance by 14.8% across four text recognition datasets. Our method generalizes to all TP-guided STISR networks.

1. Introduction

Recognizing and interpreting the text contained in images is a crucial task. Despite numerous advancements in areas such as optical character recognition (OCR), scene text detection (STD), and scene text recognition (STR), the acquisition of low-resolution images is inevitable due to various factors, including the quality of the lens, motion blur, low light, occlusion, noise, etc. Thus, recognizing text in such images remains a challenging task. To reliably recover missing structural details from such images, scene text image super-resolution (STISR) is employed as a pre-processing step to address low-resolution issues. Many studies on scene text images achieve high performance by treating the text prior as an additional modality to leverage text semantics rather than interpreting it as natural scene images. However, due to the explicit nature of the text prior,

misclassified categories within the prior knowledge have the potential to harm the STISR task. Thus, some studies address the challenges associated with the text prior. For instance, TPGSR [21] is a pioneering work that suggests incorporating feedback from a text recognizer, referred to as the text prior, as an additional modality. They also acknowledge accuracy issues with the text prior. To address this, they attempted to complement it by employing the teacher-student structure to distill the text logits from the teacher recognizer. DPMN [41] introduced a method to complement a pre-trained STISR network using two explicit image-level priors, namely the text mask and graphical recognition results. C3-STISR [39] improves the prior knowledge using the text prior and its transformed visual cue and linguistic information. LEMMA [13] enhances recognizer accuracy by minimizing errors in ground-truth text labels through fine-tuning loss.

However, the aforementioned methods focus solely on improving the performance of the text prior without addressing the fundamental instability inherent in the text prior. As a pioneering work, we propose Non-Categorical Prior (NCAP)—penultimate layer representations processed by additional adapters—instead of relying on the text prior from a pre-trained text recognizer. Figure 1 illustrates the negative impact of incorrect prior knowledge on the STISR result. Our proposed method effectively addresses the aforementioned problem by transforming explicit prior knowledge into an implicit form.

Another issue arises during joint training of the STISR network with a recognizer to minimize the domain gap between low-resolution (LR) and high-resolution (HR) images using ground-truth labels, which results in the overconfidence issue. The performance of existing pre-trained text recognizers degrades when applied to LR images. When training the recognizer along with the STISR network to overcome the domain gap between LR and HR images, training the recognizer with soft labels can lead to inaccurate prior knowledge, while training with hard labels leads to an overconfidence issue. Hence, we compare the differences between the hard labels and soft labels used in the existing loss function. We provide both theoretical and em-

LR							
	roly	leisure	tollet	no	ny	craty	bicomies
w/o Ours							
Prior:	poily	leisure	tollet	an(males	sway	carter	recoming
SR:	poily	leisure	tollet	an(males	sway	carterao	recomins
w/ Ours							
Prior:	polly	leisure	tollet	andmales	sway	fanpenel	recoving
SR:	poly	leisure	toilet	animales	away	cortera9	becoming
HR							
	GT: poly	GT: leisure	GT: toilet	GT: animales	GT: away	GT: cortex9	GT: becoming
		(a)		(b)		(c)	

Figure 1. Examples illustrating the negative impact of prior knowledge on an STISR task. (a), (b), and (c) of w/ and w/o Ours refer to the results of using CRNN [27] as a prior generator (pre-trained text recognizer) in TATT [22], PARSeq [2] as a prior generator in TATT [22], and LEMMA [13], respectively. Even with various STISR networks and a prior generator, the wrong guidance of the explicit prior still appears. Blue indicates the characters that can be influenced by prior knowledge in the STISR results. Red indicates wrong recognition results. Without our method, prior knowledge negatively influences the STISR results; however, with our proposed method, this negative influence can be effectively eliminated. Prior refers to the argmaxed text prior and SR refers to the recognition result of the SR image.

pirical analyses of the loss function. In conclusion, we propose a loss function that mitigates the overconfidence issue by employing a linear combination of the hard label and the soft label in a simple yet effective way.

The contributions of our proposed method are as follows: (1) We present NCAP, a more information-rich and stable knowledge, achieved by replacing the existing unstable text logits with penultimate layer representations. Our proposed NCAP, including its adapters, requires only 0.3% additional parameters. Compared with existing methods, NCAP fundamentally resolves explicit information issues. (2) Our work identifies the overconfidence issue that arises from joint training with ground-truth hard labels. We address this issue through a simple but effective approach employing a linear combination of softened Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence and cross-entropy losses.

2. Related Works

2.1. Scene Text Recognition (STR)

Scene text recognition aims to recognize character sequences from scene text images. Convolutional Recurrent Neural Network (CRNN) [27] predicts character sequences using Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) [12] loss through a combination of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs). ASTER [28] is a pioneering study that introduces Thin-Plate Spline (TPS) transformation for handling spatially transformed text. MORAN [20] proposed a solution for irregular text by combining multi-object rectification and attention-based sequence prediction. ABINet [11] corrects predictions through external language modeling. PARSeq [2] does not use language models separately, and performs permuted sequence modeling while removing the depen-

dence of sequence order through iteratively permuted internal language modeling. Using text as prior knowledge through STR is beneficial for STISR, but it remains a double-edged sword. The problem lies in the negative impact of the explicit categorical information from the recognizer, referred to as the text prior (TP), which can lead to incorrect STISR results when influenced by an inaccurate TP. To address this issue, we propose NCAP, which uses implicit prior knowledge.

2.2. Scene Text Image Super-Resolution (STISR)

While scene image super-resolution (SISR) primarily emphasizes enhancing the visual quality of images, STISR has recently shifted its focus to not only improving visual quality but also prioritizing the ultimate goal of enhancing text readability. TSRN [33] not only introduces the most commonly used dataset for STISR but also captures the sequential information of the text through consecutive CNN-BiLSTM layers. Subsequently, TBSRN [5] incorporates position- and content-aware losses with an attention map. TPGSR [21] introduces a text prior, which represents text categorical information obtained from a pre-trained text recognizer. TATT [22] integrates a global attention mechanism to address the imperfections caused by spatially deformed images, mitigating the structural limitations of CNNs. DPMN [41] highlights the significance of global structure by leveraging two visual priors within a fixed pre-trained STISR network. LEMMA [13] introduces a novel approach that specifically exploits character location information.

Despite the advantage of being able to read text by employing a pre-trained recognizer, the aforementioned method still has issues. As a result, TP methods that use




Figure 2. Overall architecture. We enhance the previous TP-guided STISR network by introducing a loss function that incorporates linear combinations of hard labels and soft labels, along with NCAP, which utilizes penultimate layer representations as prior knowledge.

fixed pre-trained recognizers struggle to overcome the domain gap with low-resolution images. Even when the recognizer is jointly trained with the STISR network, existing methods suffer from accuracy problems or overconfidence issues. Therefore, we propose a loss that mixes hard and soft labels to effectively resolve these issues.

3. Methodology

3.1. Overview

Figure 2 illustrates the structure of our proposed method, which contains two main different components compared to the existing method. One is NCAP and its adapters, which replace the unstable text prior with stable penultimate layer representations. The other is the mixing of hard and soft labels operation, which is intended to solve the overconfidence issue. The training input consists of a low-resolution (LR) image I_{LR} , a high-resolution (HR) image I_{HR} , and a ground-truth text label y_{gt} . The objective is to enhance the LR image $I_{LR} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 3}$ to a super-resolution (SR) image $I_{SR} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times f \times w \times 3}$ of the same size as the HR image $I_{HR} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times f \times w \times 3}$. The LR image is input to a Shallow CNN for feature extraction and simultaneously to the student recognizer for NCAP. This generates the extracted image features $f_I \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times c}$ and the penultimate layer representations h of the recognizer. The generated feature h is projected again as a f_{NCAP} by the adapters. After the fusion operation of the image feature f_I and NCAP f_{NCAP} , the combined features are input to the decoder module to generate a restored image.

3.2. Non-CATEGORICAL Prior (NCAP)

The existing studies have demonstrated the pivotal role of strong prior knowledge. TPGSR [21] demonstrated better performance than TSRN [33] without utilizing prior knowledge, while also introducing the use of prior knowledge as an effective approach. This concept has since been

utilized in other methods, such as TATT [22] and C3-STISR [39], achieving remarkable results.

However, all of these approaches failed to address the fundamental problem: inaccuracy. This can lead to incorrect guidance in the STISR task due to category inconsistency in the text prior. To address this issue, we propose a method of using penultimate layer representations, which are in the stage before being converted to text probability information, as prior knowledge. This information is not only category-free but also contains rich information and can be processed through additional adapters with only about 0.3% overhead. In existing works that use the text prior, hidden representation vectors $h \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times embed}$ are generated by predicting the sequence of characters using the pre-trained text recognizer. Then, it goes through the process of mapping h to the text logits through a prediction layer $W \in \mathbb{R}^{embed \times |A|}$. $embed$ denotes the dimension of the penultimate layer representations. L is the length of the pre-specified maximum character composed of categorical probability vectors with size $|A|$, and A denotes the alphabet set, which is composed of alphanumeric characters, and in the case of PARSeq [2], it also includes punctuation marks. Finally, the text prior f_{TP} is completed through the projection layer $W_{proj} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A| \times C}$. However, we directly use the category-free hidden representation vectors h that have not been converted to a probability distribution by projecting them through additional adapters $W_{adapters}$. C denotes the dimension of the prior feature.

$$f_{NCAP} = \text{PreLU}(\text{PreLU}(h \cdot W_{adapter_1}) \cdot W_{adapter_2}) \quad (1)$$

Equation 1 illustrates the process of generating NCAP from penultimate layer representations. $h \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times embed}$ is mapped to $\mathbb{R}^{L \times \frac{embed}{2}}$ by $W_{adapter_1}$ and then mapped to $\mathbb{R}^{L \times C}$ by $W_{adapter_2}$. Parametric Rectified Linear Unit (PreLU) [14] is an activation function that provides learnable gradients in the negative range.




Figure 3. Word- and character-level reliability diagram. LEMMA [13] is the result visualized with the pre-trained weights of the official code, LEMMA* corresponds to the result of re-training the model using the official code of LEMMA [13], LS [14] represents a label smoothing technique, and Distillation represents the result of training a model using a loss function that eliminates the learning process with hard labels, opting to learn from soft labels instead. Ours is the result of a model trained with a linear combination loss of hard and soft labels. Please refer to the supplementary materials for the calculation of character-level reliability.

3.3. Overcoming the Domain Gap between LR-HR Images While Avoiding Overconfidence

As TPGSR [21] revealed the low performance of a fixed recognizer, the method of jointly training the text recognizer with the STISR network to overcome the domain gap between LR and HR images became popular. Therefore, to reduce the domain gap and improve performance, it is inevitable to train recognizers with the STISR network. As joint training with the STISR network improves performance, it also introduces new challenges, such as the overconfidence issue. This problem is clearly illustrated in Figure 3, where fine-tuning the recognizer with ground-truth hard labels leads to overconfidence in the prior modality. Depending on the ground-truth label used, methods can be broadly classified into two categories. One approach is to train a student recognizer with soft labels generated from the teacher recognizer through a teacher-student structure, as seen in TPGSR [21], TATT [22], and C3-STISR [39]. Another approach is to train directly using ground-truth hard labels, exemplified by LEMMA [13]. However, both methods also have their own problems. In the method that relies only on soft labels, there is an increase in inconsistency in the prior knowledge, while in the method relying only on hard labels, overconfidence is induced, ultimately leading to a decrease in performance. To address the overconfidence issue and enhance performance, we propose a method that leverages the strengths of both approaches by linearly combining hard and soft labels.

Theoretical support. Kullback-Leibler (KL) diver-

gence loss combined with mean absolute error (MAE) loss has been utilized in both TPGSR [21] and TATT [22]. To analyze its impact, we compare KL divergence loss alone with KL divergence loss combined with MAE loss by examining the gradients generated through the partial derivatives of these loss functions. Additionally, our goal is to explore the conditions and penalties that lead to effective performance improvements while addressing the issue of overconfidence.

Kullback-Leibler Divergence Loss.

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{KL}^s}{\partial z_i} = p_i^s - p_i^t \quad (2)$$

The gradient of \mathcal{L}_{KL}^s with respect to a student’s logit value z_i is defined as in Equation (2), and since there is no case for $i = true$, so all indices i have the same gradient range. Let p_i^s be the student’s prediction and p_i^t the teacher’s prediction at the i -th class.

Kullback-Leibler Divergence Loss with Mean Absolute Error Loss.

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE}^s}{\partial z_i} = p_i^s - p_i^t + \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } z_i > t_i \\ -1, & \text{if } z_i < t_i \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

for $z_i > t_i$,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE}^s}{\partial z_i} = p_i^s - (-1 + p_i^t) \quad (4)$$

for $z_i < t_i$,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE}^s}{\partial z_i} = p_i^s - (1 + p_i^t) \quad (5)$$




Figure 4. Results of character-level distribution difference of the text logits for training data by each loss function. (a) is a linear combination of softened KL divergence loss and cross-entropy loss, (b) involves KL divergence loss along with MAE loss, which are used in TPGSR [21] and TATT [22], and (c) corresponds to the cross-entropy loss used in LEMMA [13].

Loss Function	ASTER [28]	MORAN [20]	CRNN [27]	Average
w/o loss	59.9%	56.3%	48.4%	54.9%
\mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE}	66.6%	64.1%	57.1%	62.6%
\mathcal{L}_{CE}	66.0%	63.2%	56.3%	61.8%
\mathcal{L}_{CE} with LS	66.5%	62.8%	55.6%	61.6%
\mathcal{L}_{CE+KL}	66.1%	64.5%	56.8%	62.5%
$\mathcal{L}_{CE+KL+MAE}$	66.9%	63.9%	57.7%	62.8%
$\mathcal{L}_{CE+Softened KL}$	66.8%	64.6%	57.5%	63.0%

Table 1. Recognition accuracies of the TextZoom [33] for each loss function using ASTER [28], MORAN [20], and CRNN [27]. w/o loss trains the network using only the loss of the STISR network without any loss function for the recognizer. \mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE} is the loss function proposed in TPGSR [21], and \mathcal{L}_{CE} is the loss function used in LEMMA [13]. LS represents a label smoothing [14] technique. Average refers to average accuracy.

t_i represents the teacher’s logit value. Equations (3) to (5) define the gradient of \mathcal{L}_{KL+MAE}^s with respect to a student’s logit value z_i , where both MAE loss and KL divergence loss, as used in TPGSR [21] and TATT [22], are applied. The inclusion of MAE loss imposes, on average, larger gradients than using only the KL divergence loss from Equation (2). This can sharpen soft label distributions. We found that sharpening inaccurate soft labels destabilizes performance.

Figure 4 shows the character-level distribution plot on the TextZoom [33] train data for each loss. Our proposed method has the lowest standard deviation of 0.1410 and shows a smooth distribution. Table 1 displays the results when each loss function is applied to the STISR network. The best performance is achieved when both ground-truth hard labels and the teacher’s soft labels are utilized together, particularly when the soft labels exhibit a smoother profile.

We made three key observations: (1) Despite the overconfidence induced by the ground-truth hard label, it remains an essential factor for performance enhancement. (2) Soft labels effectively mitigate overconfidence. (3) Mixing hard and soft labels shows greater effectiveness. The performance improves as the distribution of soft labels becomes smoother. Thus, we propose a linear combination

of softened KL divergence loss by temperature scaling and cross-entropy loss as a new loss function.

3.4. Training Objective

We incorporate the proposed method into both TATT [22], and LEMMA [13]. We do not alter the implementation details of the various loss functions for each method, but only modify the loss function, as shown in Equations (6) to (8), to address the overconfidence issue by linearly combining hard labels and soft labels. α is a hyperparameter for balance. Please refer to the supplementary materials for details on the various loss functions used in each method.

$$\mathcal{L} = (1 - \alpha)\mathcal{L}_{CE}(p^s, y) + \alpha\mathcal{L}_{KL}(p^s(\tau), p^t(\tau)) \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}(p^s, y) = - \sum_i y_i \log p_i^s \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{KL}(p^s(\tau), p^t(\tau)) = \beta \cdot \tau^2 \sum_i p_i^t(\tau) \log \frac{p_i^t(\tau)}{p_i^s(\tau)} \quad (8)$$

where s indicates the student text recognizer, t indicates the teacher text recognizer, y is a ground-truth label, and τ is a temperature scaling parameter used for a smoother distribution.

4. Experiments

We introduce the experimental dataset, evaluation methods, and implementation details. We demonstrate the superiority of our proposed method through comparisons with state-of-the-art methods and various experiments.

4.1. Datasets

Scene Text Image Super-Resolution Dataset. TextZoom [33] is a widely utilized dataset in STISR tasks. This dataset extracts the text-containing regions from two distinct super-resolution datasets, RealSR [3] and SR-RAW [38], to create pairs of LR and HR images. The training set comprises 17,367 LR-HR image pairs

Method	Prior Error Rate		SR Error Rate		Pearson Correlation	
	WER	CER	WER	CER	WER	CER
TATT [22]	52.3%	32.2%	47.2%	30.7%	0.7146	0.8026
TATT [22] w/ Ours	37.4%	21.3%	43.3%	27.1%	0.6626	0.7359
Δ	-14.9%	-11.0%	-3.9%	-3.6%	-7.3%	-8.3%
LEMMA [13]	76.1%	58.3%	44.0%	28.3%	0.3465	0.4580
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	77.6%	60.5%	42.1%	26.9%	0.3279	0.3052
Δ	+1.5%	+2.2%	-2.0%	-1.3%	-5.4%	-33.4%

Table 2. Comparison of Pearson correlation coefficients between the prior text logits error rate and restored image text recognition error rate. WER and CER represent word error rate and character error rate, respectively.

Method	NCAP	Adapters	MACs	#Params
TATT [22]			4.60 G	31.44 M
TATT [22] w/ Ours	✓		4.64 G	31.52 M
Δ	✓	✓	4.43 G	31.52 M
			-3.7%	+0.3%
LEMMA [13]			6.69 G	39.75 M
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	✓		6.69 G	39.90 M
Δ	✓	✓	6.71 G	39.90 M
			+0.3%	+0.4%

Table 3. Results of computational complexity and increase in trainable parameters.

with corresponding ground-truth text labels. The test set includes a total of 4,373 image pairs, distributed across three categories (1,619 for easy, 1,411 for medium, and 1,343 for hard) based on focal length. All LR images are resized to 16×64 , and the HR images are adjusted to 32×128 .

Scene Text Recognition Dataset. To assess the robustness of our proposed method, we evaluate it on scene text recognition datasets: IIIT5K [23], ICDAR2015 [16], SVT [32], and SVTP [25]. We assess the extent to which degraded images can be restored. These images are converted into LR images through manual degradation, following the approach used in previous studies such as TATT [22] and LEMMA [13]. Additionally, we examine the generalization performance of models trained with the TextZoom [33].

4.2. Evaluation Metrics

Following TPGRS [21], TATT [22], and LEMMA [13], the performance of restored images is evaluated using three commonly used methods: text recognition accuracy, Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), and Structure-Similarity Index Measure (SSIM). In the case of accuracy, it is evaluated using pre-trained recognizers CRNN [27], ASTER [28], and MORAN [20] as an evaluation metrics to evaluate readability, which is the ultimate goal of the STISR task. PSNR and SSIM are used to evaluate the visual quality of the restored image.

4.3. Implementation Details

We built our proposed method on TATT [22] and LEMMA [13] respectively. We use the same hyperparam-

eters used in the formal paper in the official implementation of the model. All of our models are run on PyTorch version 1.13.1. All experiments are performed on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU. The experimental settings of the two works used as baselines, TATT [22] and LEMMA [13], are completely identical, and the implementation details (batch size, running rate, optimizer, embedding dimension, etc.) will be covered in the supplementary materials. In TATT [22], the pre-trained recognizer is changed from CRNN [27] to PARSeq [2]. The loss function for distillation in both models, α is set to 0.5, β is set to 0.7, and τ is set to 3.

4.4. Ablation Studies

We examine the impact and efficiency of NCAP and the effectiveness of each module. And we compare it to methods like label smoothing [14], which have been used to address the overconfidence issue. All evaluations are conducted on TextZoom [33], the STISR dataset, and the text recognizer used for evaluation is CRNN [27].

Impact on NCAP. Our performance evaluations focus on two aspects to assess the influence of NCAP: visualizing results that overcome prior knowledge instability, and analyzing the correlation between prior knowledge error rates and STISR error rates. First, Figure 1 shows that NCAP ensures correct STISR outcomes despite incorrect prior knowledge. Second, Table 2 illustrates experiments on NCAP’s dependency. In TATT [22], trained only with the teacher’s soft label, the proposed method lowers the error rate of prior knowledge and reduces its correlation with STISR errors. Similarly, in LEMMA [13], even though the error rate of prior knowledge increases, the Pearson correlation between prior knowledge errors and STISR errors decreases. Thus, our method no longer relies on unstable text categorical information.

Efficiency of NCAP. We compare the increase in the number of parameters required to process penultimate layer representations instead of text logits. Table 3 specifies the overall computational complexity and trainable parameters. When NCAP is introduced to TATT [22] and LEMMA [13], utilized as baselines, the average increase in overhead is only 0.3%.

Method	Loss	NCAP	Adapters	ASTER [28]	MORAN [20]	CRNN [27]	Average
TATT [22]				63.7%	59.4%	52.8%	58.6%
	✓			66.8%	63.3%	56.0%	62.0%
TATT [22] w/ Ours	✓	✓		67.0%	63.8%	56.8%	62.5%
	✓	✓	✓	68.1%	64.6%	58.3%	63.7%
LEMMA [13]				66.0%	63.2%	56.3%	61.8%
	✓			66.8%	64.6%	57.5%	63.0%
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	✓	✓		66.9%	65.1%	58.0%	63.3%
	✓	✓	✓	67.9%	65.0%	58.1%	63.7%

Table 4. Effectiveness of each module. Loss signifies the linear combination of the softened KL divergence and cross-entropy losses.

Method	ASTER [28]				MORAN [20]				CRNN [27]			
	Easy	Medium	Hard	Overall	Easy	Medium	Hard	Overall	Easy	Medium	Hard	Overall
Bicubic	64.7%	42.4%	31.2%	47.2%	60.6%	37.9%	30.8%	44.1%	36.4%	21.1%	21.1%	26.8%
TBSRN [5]	75.7%	59.9%	41.6%	60.0%	74.1%	57.0%	40.8%	58.4%	59.6%	47.1%	35.3%	48.1%
TG [6]	77.9%	60.2%	42.4%	61.3%	75.8%	57.8%	41.4%	59.4%	61.2%	47.6%	35.5%	48.9%
TPGSR [21]	77.0%	60.9%	42.4%	60.9%	72.2%	57.8%	41.3%	57.8%	61.0%	49.9%	36.7%	49.8%
TPGSR-3 [21]	78.9%	62.7%	44.5%	62.8%	74.9%	60.5%	44.1%	60.5%	63.1%	52.0%	38.6%	51.8%
DPMN (+TATT) [41]	79.3%	64.1%	45.2%	63.9%	73.3%	61.5%	43.9%	60.4%	64.4%	54.2%	39.2%	53.4%
C3-STISR [39]	79.1%	63.3%	46.8%	64.1%	74.2%	61.0%	43.2%	60.5%	65.2%	53.6%	39.8%	53.7%
TextDiff-200 [19]	80.8%	66.5%	48.7%	66.4%	77.7%	62.5%	44.6%	62.7%	64.8%	55.4%	39.9%	54.2%
RTSRN-3 [37]	80.4%	66.1%	49.1%	66.2%	77.1%	63.3%	46.5%	63.2%	67.0%	59.2%	42.6%	57.0%
TCDM [24]	81.3%	65.1%	50.1%	66.5%	77.6%	62.9%	45.9%	63.1%	67.3%	57.3%	42.7%	56.5%
RGDiffSR [40]	81.1%	65.4%	49.1%	66.2%	78.6%	62.1%	45.4%	63.1%	67.6%	56.5%	42.7%	56.4%
TATT [22]	78.9%	63.4%	45.4%	63.6%	72.5%	60.2%	43.1%	59.5%	62.6%	53.4%	39.8%	52.6%
TATT [22] w/ Ours	81.5%	68.4%	51.5%	68.1%	76.4%	65.7%	49.3%	64.6%	66.5%	60.8%	45.8%	58.3%
Δ	+2.6%	+5.0%	+6.1%	+4.5%	+3.9%	+5.5%	+6.2%	+5.1%	+3.9%	+7.4%	+6.0%	+5.7%
LEMMA [13]	81.1%	66.3%	47.4%	66.0%	77.7%	64.4%	44.6%	63.2%	67.1%	58.8%	40.6%	56.3%
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	81.9%	68.3%	50.7%	67.9%	78.6%	65.6%	47.9%	65.0%	68.1%	59.8%	44.4%	58.1%
Δ	+0.8%	+2.0%	+3.3%	+1.9%	+0.9%	+1.2%	+3.3%	+1.8%	+1.0%	+1.0%	+3.8%	+1.8%
HR	94.2%	87.7%	76.2%	86.6%	91.2%	85.3%	74.2%	84.1%	76.4%	75.1%	64.6%	72.4%

Table 5. Recognition accuracies of various mainstream STISR methods across the three subsets of TextZoom [33]. Overall refers to overall accuracy. Best scores are bold.

Effectiveness of Each Module. We evaluated the effectiveness of each module by sequentially adding them. As shown in Table 4, the best performance was achieved when all proposed methods were applied. Implementing the linear combination loss of hard and soft labels, an effective method for mitigating the overconfidence issue in the text knowledge modality, resulted in an average accuracy improvement by approximately 3.4% for TATT [22] and by about 1.2% for LEMMA [13]. With the additional application of NCAP, there was an improvement by around 3.9% for TATT [22] and by about 1.5% for LEMMA [13]. Finally, by replacing the existing MLP projector with a Conv_{1×1}, we achieved an average performance improvement by 5.0% compared to TATT [22] and 1.8% compared to LEMMA [13].

Different Choices on Overcoming the Domain Gap. We aim to analyze the effects of methods considered effective in overcoming the overconfidence issue, including no fine-tuning loss and label smoothing [14]. Table 1 displays the performance change when each technique is added to the baseline. The most conventional method involves using a fixed text recognizer. However, as outlined in TPGSR [21], the text prior generated from a fixed text recognizer

does not induce overconfidence, but its performance is inherently low as it struggles to bridge the domain gap between LR and HR images. In label smoothing [14], the ground-truth hard text label is converted into a soft label by uniformly distributing probabilities across other classes without using a teacher network. However, it fails to address overconfidence and results in poor performance.

4.5. Comparison with State-of-the-Arts

We initially assess TextZoom [33], a widely used STISR dataset, by evaluating the text recognition accuracy of restored images using pre-trained text recognizers CRNN [27], ASTER [28], and MORAN [20]. Additionally, we evaluate the generalization capabilities using STR datasets that sampled LR images.

Results on TextZoom. We focused on evaluating recognition accuracy, and the proposed method showed consistent improvements across all three pre-trained recognizers. As shown in Table 5, ASTER [28], MORAN [20], and CRNN [27] with TATT [22] improved by 4.5%, 5.1%, and 5.7%, respectively, and LEMMA [13] improved by 1.9%, 1.8%, and 1.8%. The visualization of SR images and recognition results is shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5. Visualization of SR images and recognition result on TextZoom [33] by CRNN [27]. Red indicates wrong recognition results.

Method	Light Degradation				Severe Degradation			
	IIT5K [23]	IC15 [16]	SVT [32]	SVTP [25]	IIT5K [23]	IC15 [16]	SVT [32]	SVTP [25]
BICUBIC	34.3%	36.6%	5.7%	62.5%	1.3%	0.1%	0.0%	11.1%
TATT [22]	55.1%	50.4%	44.7%	79.3%	16.3%	11.0%	0.0%	30.9%
TATT [22] w/ Ours	60.7%	58.9%	68.3%	80.5%	22.1%	13.4%	3.0%	32.1%
Δ	+5.6%	+8.6%	+23.7%	+1.1%	+5.8%	+2.4%	+3.0%	+1.1%
LEMMA [13]	23.0%	21.4%	23.5%	36.8%	9.0%	3.4%	0.0%	18.0%
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	63.0%	62.6%	47.1%	79.2%	20.4%	12.8%	0.3%	34.0%
Δ	+40.0%	+41.2%	+23.6%	+42.4%	+11.4%	+9.3%	+0.3%	+15.9%

Table 6. Recognition accuracies on scene text recognition datasets with manual degradation applied. We divide the degradation parameters into two categories: light degradation and severe degradation. Manual degradation includes Gaussian blur and Gaussian noise.

Method	PSNR	SSIM
TATT [22]	21.52	0.7930
TATT [22] w/ Ours	21.53	0.7925
LEMMA [13]	20.90	0.7792
LEMMA [13] w/ Ours	20.55	0.7707

Table 7. Comparison of PSNR and SSIM with and without applying the proposed method.

Results on STR datasets. We evaluate our method’s effectiveness in transforming low-resolution images for text recognition using a scene text recognition dataset and assess generalization with TextZoom [33]. We sample images smaller than 16×64 and apply manual degradation, including Gaussian blur and Gaussian noise. Since LEMMA [13] uses random hyperparameters, we standardized them by categorizing degradation into light and severe. Detailed setup and hyperparameters are in the supplementary materials. Table 6 shows our method improves TATT [22] by 13.7% and LEMMA [13] by 23.0% across both categories.

5. Discussion

By applying our proposed method to existing models like TATT [22] and LEMMA [13], we achieved significant accuracy improvements. However, as shown in Table 7, tradi-

tional STISR evaluation metrics such as PSNR and SSIM remained similar or slightly decreased. This is because our approach, which aims to improve readability and accuracy by further reducing noise, can lower visual evaluation scores due to the inherent noise in ground-truth images. While LEMMA [13] also discusses the trade-off between accuracy and visual metrics, the produced SR images perform better than visual metrics. Visualization and detailed analysis are provided in the supplementary materials.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we identify two key issues with the use of text priors in pre-trained text recognizers: the explicit text prior can cause inconsistencies in STISR tasks, and the method of bridging the domain gap between LR and HR images leads to overconfidence and poor performance. To address this, we propose Non-Categorical Prior (NCAP), which replaces unstable text priors with category-free representations. Through theoretical and empirical analysis of prior knowledge, we show that a smoother categorical distribution produces better results. Our method surpasses state-of-the-art approaches, improving performance across all metrics and generalizing well to the STR dataset. It is compatible with all STISR networks using explicit priors.

References

- [1] Jeonghun Baek, Geewook Kim, Junyeop Lee, Sungrae Park, Dongyoon Han, Sangdoo Yun, Seong Joon Oh, and Hwal-suk Lee. What is wrong with scene text recognition model comparisons? dataset and model analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4715–4723, 2019.
- [2] Darwin Bautista and Rowel Atienza. Scene text recognition with permuted autoregressive sequence models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 178–196. Springer, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [3] Jianrui Cai, Hui Zeng, Hongwei Yong, Zisheng Cao, and Lei Zhang. Toward real-world single image super-resolution: A new benchmark and a new model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3086–3095, 2019. [5](#)
- [4] Defang Chen, Jian-Ping Mei, Hailin Zhang, Can Wang, Yan Feng, and Chun Chen. Knowledge distillation with the reused teacher classifier. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11933–11942, 2022.
- [5] Jingye Chen, Bin Li, and Xiangyang Xue. Scene text telescope: Text-focused scene image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12026–12035, 2021. [2](#), [7](#)
- [6] Jingye Chen, Haiyang Yu, Jianqi Ma, Bin Li, and Xiangyang Xue. Text gestalt: Stroke-aware scene text image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 285–293, 2022. [7](#)
- [7] Xiangyu Chen, Xintao Wang, Jiantao Zhou, and Chao Dong. Activating more pixels in image super-resolution transformer. arxiv 2022. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.04437*, 1, 2022.
- [8] Chao Dong, Chen Change Loy, Kaiming He, and Xiaoou Tang. Learning a deep convolutional network for image super-resolution. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part IV 13*, pages 184–199. Springer, 2014.
- [9] Chao Dong, Chen Change Loy, Kaiming He, and Xiaoou Tang. Image super-resolution using deep convolutional networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 38(2):295–307, 2015.
- [10] Chao Dong, Ximei Zhu, Yubin Deng, Chen Change Loy, and Yu Qiao. Boosting optical character recognition: A super-resolution approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02211*, 2015.
- [11] Shancheng Fang, Hongtao Xie, Yuxin Wang, Zhendong Mao, and Yongdong Zhang. Read like humans: Autonomous, bidirectional and iterative language modeling for scene text recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7098–7107, 2021. [2](#)
- [12] Alex Graves, Santiago Fernández, Faustino Gomez, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 369–376, 2006. [2](#)
- [13] Hang Guo, Tao Dai, Guanghao Meng, and Shu-Tao Xia. Towards robust scene text image super-resolution via explicit location enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09749*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [14] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1026–1034, 2015. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [15] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [16] Dimosthenis Karatzas, Lluís Gomez-Bigorda, Angelos Nicolaou, Suman Ghosh, Andrew Bagdanov, Masakazu Iwamura, Jiri Matas, Lukas Neumann, Vijay Ramaseshan Chandrasekhar, Shijian Lu, et al. Icdar 2015 competition on robust reading. In *2015 13th international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 1156–1160. IEEE, 2015. [6](#), [8](#)
- [17] Kyungyul Kim, ByeongMoon Ji, Doyoung Yoon, and Sangheum Hwang. Self-knowledge distillation with progressive refinement of targets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6567–6576, 2021.
- [18] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [19] Baolin Liu, Zongyuan Yang, Pengfei Wang, Junjie Zhou, Ziqi Liu, Ziyi Song, Yan Liu, and Yongping Xiong. Textdiff: Mask-guided residual diffusion models for scene text image super-resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06743*, 2023. [7](#)
- [20] Canjie Luo, Lianwen Jin, and Zenghui Sun. Moran: A multi-object rectified attention network for scene text recognition. *Pattern Recognition*, 90:109–118, 2019. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [21] Jianqi Ma, Shi Guo, and Lei Zhang. Text prior guided scene text image super-resolution. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 32:1341–1353, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [22] Jianqi Ma, Zhetong Liang, and Lei Zhang. A text attention network for spatial deformation robust scene text image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5911–5920, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [23] Anand Mishra, Karteek Alahari, and CV Jawahar. Scene text recognition using higher order language priors. In *BMVC-British machine vision conference*. BMVA, 2012. [6](#), [8](#)
- [24] Chihiro Noguchi, Shun Fukuda, and Masao Yamanaka. Scene text image super-resolution based on text-conditional diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1485–1495, 2024. [7](#)
- [25] Trung Quy Phan, Palaiahnakote Shivakumara, Shangxuan Tian, and Chew Lim Tan. Recognizing text with perspective distortion in natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 569–576, 2013. [6](#), [8](#)

- [26] Chitwan Saharia, Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Tim Salimans, David J Fleet, and Mohammad Norouzi. Image super-resolution via iterative refinement. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(4):4713–4726, 2022.
- [27] Baoguang Shi, Xiang Bai, and Cong Yao. An end-to-end trainable neural network for image-based sequence recognition and its application to scene text recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(11):2298–2304, 2016. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [28] Baoguang Shi, Mingkun Yang, Xinggang Wang, Pengyuan Lyu, Cong Yao, and Xiang Bai. Aster: An attentional scene text recognizer with flexible rectification. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 41(9):2035–2048, 2018. 2, 5, 6, 7
- [29] Jian Sun, Zongben Xu, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Gradient profile prior and its applications in image super-resolution and enhancement. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 20(6):1529–1542, 2010.
- [30] Hanh TM Tran and Tien Ho-Phuoc. Deep laplacian pyramid network for text images super-resolution. in 2019 IEEE international conference on computing and communication technologies (rivf), 2019.
- [31] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [32] Kai Wang, Boris Babenko, and Serge Belongie. End-to-end scene text recognition. In *2011 International conference on computer vision*, pages 1457–1464. IEEE, 2011. 6, 8
- [33] Wenjia Wang, Enze Xie, Xuebo Liu, Wenhai Wang, Ding Liang, Chunhua Shen, and Xiang Bai. Scene text image super-resolution in the wild. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part X 16*, pages 650–666. Springer, 2020. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [34] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [35] Qizhe Xie, Minh-Thang Luong, Eduard Hovy, and Quoc V Le. Self-training with noisy student improves imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10687–10698, 2020.
- [36] Linfeng Zhang, Jiebo Song, Anni Gao, Jingwei Chen, Chenglong Bao, and Kaisheng Ma. Be your own teacher: Improve the performance of convolutional neural networks via self distillation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 3713–3722, 2019.
- [37] Wenyu Zhang, Xin Deng, Baojun Jia, Xingtong Yu, Yifan Chen, Jin Ma, Qing Ding, and Xinming Zhang. Pixel adapter: A graph-based post-processing approach for scene text image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 2168–2179, 2023. 7
- [38] Xuaner Zhang, Qifeng Chen, Ren Ng, and Vladlen Koltun. Zoom to learn, learn to zoom. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3762–3770, 2019. 5
- [39] Minyi Zhao, Miao Wang, Fan Bai, Bingjia Li, Jie Wang, and Shuigeng Zhou. C3-stir: Scene text image super-resolution with triple clues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.14044*, 2022. 1, 3, 4, 7
- [40] Yuxuan Zhou, Liangcai Gao, Zhi Tang, and Baole Wei. Recognition-guided diffusion model for scene text image super-resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13317*, 2023. 7
- [41] Shipeng Zhu, Zuoyan Zhao, Pengfei Fang, and Hui Xue. Improving scene text image super-resolution via dual prior modulation network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10414*, 2023. 1, 2, 7