

View Reviews

Paper ID

52

Paper Title

Multi-frame Super-resolution from Noisy Data

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. [Summary] In 3-5 sentences, describe the key ideas, experiments, and their significance.

The authors concentrate on multi-frame super-resolution problem in case of clipped-AWGN noise.

They show the usefulness of two adaptive regularisers based on anisotropic diffusion ideas and introduce a novel non-local one (sector diffusion.) with one-sided differences and superior performance.

Moreover they combine it with all six variants of the classical super-resolution observational model that arise from permutations of its three operators for warping, blurring, and downsampling.

Their evaluation in the practically relevant noisy scenario produces very interesting results.

2. [Strengths] What are the strengths of the paper? Clearly explain why these aspects of the paper are valuable.

They have proposed a novel non-local one regularizer: the sector diffusion (SD).

It is the first diffusion method that uses only one-sided directional derivatives. In its local formulation, this is a model that offers also structural novelties from a mathematical perspective, since it cannot be described in terms of a partial differential equation.

Their evaluation that combine SD with all six variants of the classical super-resolution observational model, that arise from permutations of its three operators for warping, blurring, and downsampling, produces new insight in the practically relevant noisy scenario.

3. [Weaknesses] What are the weaknesses of the paper? Clearly explain why these aspects of the paper are weak. Please make the comments very concrete based on facts (e.g. list relevant citations if you feel the ideas are not novel).

No particular weakness

5. [Justification of rating] Please explain how the strengths and weaknesses aforementioned were weighed in for the rating.

It is a well written paper with interesting proposal and results.

6. [Detailed comments] Additional comments regarding the paper (e.g. typos, any suggestion to make the submission stronger)

End p. 4: diffusion tensor D with eigenvectors v_1 and v_2 . Letter D ?

S_I is the set of pixels within a particular sector I . How can be chosen a good sector size?

7. [Confidence] Reviewer's confidence in their recommendation.

Very confident

Reviewer #2

Questions

1. [Summary] In 3-5 sentences, describe the key ideas, experiments, and their significance.

The present paper proposes a novel method for multi-frame super-resolution in two dimensions, i.e., the problem of obtaining a high-resolution image from several noisy low-resolution images. It combines two ideas: First, to obtain a good observational model by finding the best permutation of warping, blurring and downsampling operators, as also done in [19,1]. Second, to employ a novel edge-enhancing-diffusion inspired non-local smoothing model that is based on circular segments, called sector diffusion in the paper. The sector diffusion model is first tested and evaluated experimentally on denoising problems with a focus on heavy, clipped noise, showing superiority compared to edge-enhancing diffusion (EED). Afterwards, the method is evaluated quantitatively for multi-frame super-resolution showing again superiority compared to EED and indicating an optimal observational model. The paper thus contributes, as the author(s) state, to the scarce amount of literature on super-resolution with substantial clipped noise. This problem is indeed significant, as one often has low-resolution video data available and seeks a high-resolution image with more details such as clearly readable letter, for instance. Further, image denoising is a classical task in image processing with significance for basically every image processing problem.

2. [Strengths] What are the strengths of the paper? Clearly explain why these aspects of the paper are valuable.

Overall, the paper convinces the reader of the proposed method:

- * The sector diffusion approach is definitely interesting and might become useful and relevant for a variety of image processing problems. Its qualitative and quantitative performance for heavily degraded images as shown in the paper is remarkable.
- * The quantitative performance for the super-resolution problem is very good and could improve the state of the art for this problem.
- * The design of the method as well as its evaluation are done with great care and take, for instance, also model uncertainties into account. It can be expected to be robust for a variety of data.
- * The overall approach bases on theoretically well-understood techniques for diffusion equations. Consequently, their qualitative behavior is most likely predictable and stable. In particular, it should be unlikely that unexpected artifacts are produced.

3. [Weaknesses] What are the weaknesses of the paper? Clearly explain why these aspects of the paper are weak. Please make the comments very concrete based on facts (e.g. list relevant citations if you feel the ideas are not novel).

There are also some drawbacks related to the paper:

- * The contribution lacks a clear focus. Its most innovative part appears to be the introduction of sector diffusion which is a regularization technique. The remaining parts such as the application to super-resolution as well as observational model optimization already exist as such in the literature. In this light, more focus could have been laid on innovative aspects.
- * Many aspects of the work lack theoretical justification. For instance, there might be a good reason that one-sided directional derivatives have not been described in the literature so far in this context as there is also a lack of theory for associated diffusion equations. Further, there is no convergence analysis for the proposed iterative scheme.
- * The evaluation of sector diffusion as a denoising method is only done with respect to edge-enhancing diffusion. Since there are many other approaches, also in the context of scale space and variational methods, more comparisons would have been desirable in order to obtain a fair assessment of the performance of the method.
- * The evaluation of the numerical experiments for super-resolution is solely based on the mean squared error (MSE) and no qualitative results are shown. The MSE has some drawbacks with respect to the assessment of visual quality. Respective images are missing, which is surprising, also given that the page limit is not exhausted.

5. [Justification of rating] Please explain how the strengths and weaknesses aforementioned were weighed in for the rating.

The strengths of the paper clearly outweigh the weaknesses. As only some parts are innovative and there is a strong focus on a specific application, the performance of the method as well as qualitative and quantitative results, the contents of the paper is best conveyed by a poster presentation.

6. [Detailed comments] Additional comments regarding the paper (e.g. typos, any suggestion to make the submission stronger)

- * page 2: What is it mean precisely that W_i expresses the motion of the image? I would be better to call it a warping operator as later done in the manuscript.
- * page 3: It appears that the acronym EED is not properly introduced. It stands for edge-enhancing diffusion, I guess.
- * page 5: In (9), it should read W_i instead of W_k . Also on page 7, (16).
- * page 6: Note that it would not be trivial to set up a theory of diffusion equations based on one-sided directional derivatives. The most straightforward approach via a weak derivative and associated Sobolev-type spaces would not be able to distinguish antipodal directions. In this light, it would be best to tone down the statements regarding non-existence of literature so far.
- * page 8: It would be helpful for the reader to known exactly what is meant with images structures. Are, for instance, textures also seen as image structures? Diffusion usually destroys fine textures.

7. [Confidence] Reviewer's confidence in their recommendation.

Very confident