# End-to-end optimized image compression

Johannes Ballé Center for Neural Science, NYU Howard Hughes Medical Institute (now with Google Inc.)

*joint work with:* Valero Laparra, Universitat de València Eero P. Simoncelli, CNS/Courant Institute/HHMI

International Conference on Learning Representations, Toulon, 2017









X











- *D*: distortion, e.g. mean squared error
- *R*: rate, ideally close to Shannon entropy of *q*

rate: 0.17 bits/pixel

![](_page_9_Picture_1.jpeg)

rate: 0.12 bits/pixel

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

coarser quantization: lower rate, higher distortion

rate: 0.32 bits/pixel

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

finer quantization: higher rate, lower distortion

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

improved transforms, non-uniform quantization, inter/intra prediction, deblocking, adaptive partitioning, etc.

#### Nonlinear transform coding

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

 $g_a, g_s$ : multivariate, parametric nonlinear functions (if it helps, think of them as neural networks)

## Architecture of transformation

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

sigmoid-type nonlinearities
local response normalization (LRN)
see our ICLR 2016 paper for details

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

sigmoid-type nonlinearities
local response normalization (LRN)
see our ICLR 2016 paper for details

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

sigmoid-type nonlinearities
local response normalization (LRN)
see our ICLR 2016 paper for details

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

– sigmoid-type nonlinearities– local response normalization (LRN)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

sigmoid-type nonlinearities

- local response normalization (LRN)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

sigmoid-type nonlinearities

- local response normalization (LRN)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

generalization of:

- sigmoid-type nonlinearities
- local response normalization (LRN)

#### Nonlinear transform coding

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

optimize  $g_a$ ,  $g_s$  for rate and distortion numerically  $L[g_a, g_s, P_q] = -\mathbb{E}[\log_2 P_q] + \lambda \mathbb{E}[d(x, \hat{x})]$  R

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

differentiable and continuous stochastic approximation

other approaches: Theis et al., 2017 Jang et al., 2017 Maddison et al., 2017

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

$$L = \mathbb{E}\left[-\sum_{i} \log_2 P_{q_i}(q_i) + \lambda \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} - \boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2^2\right]$$

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

proxy loss:  

$$L = \mathbb{E}\left[-\sum_{i} \log_2 p_{\tilde{y}_i}(\tilde{y}_i) + \lambda \left\|\tilde{x} - x\right\|_2^2\right]$$

## Wait! Isn't this just an autoencoder?

(Yes and no.)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Results

## original

![](_page_31_Picture_1.jpeg)

## JPEG @ 0.119 bits/px

![](_page_32_Picture_1.jpeg)

## JPEG 2000 @ 0.107 bits/px

![](_page_33_Picture_1.jpeg)

## proposed @ 0.106 bits/px

![](_page_34_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### JPEG

original

![](_page_35_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### proposed

## We consistently outperform JPEG 2000

1.00 better 0.98 luma MS-SSIM 0.96 0.94 0.92 JPEG 0.90 JPEG 2000 proposed 0.88 **L** 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 bit rate [bit/px]

better

## original

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

## JPEG @ 0.170 bits/px

![](_page_38_Picture_1.jpeg)

## JPEG 2000 @ 0.167 bits/px

![](_page_39_Picture_1.jpeg)

proposed @ 0.167 bits/px

![](_page_40_Picture_1.jpeg)

JPEG

![](_page_41_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### original

Thanks!

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

More images, metrics, and the model parameters: http://www.cns.nyu.edu/~lcv/iclr2017/

Comparison to compression state-of-the-art (BPG): come to our poster tomorrow morning!