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Abstract—Recently, it has been shown that deep neural networks can significantly improve the performance of single image super-resolution (SISR). Numerous studies have focused on raising the quantitative quality of super-resolved (SR) images. However, these methods that target PSNR maximization usually produce smooth images at large upsampling. The introduction of generative adversarial networks (GANs) can mitigate this issue and show impressive results with synthetic high-frequency textures. Nevertheless, these GAN-based approaches always tend to add fake textures and even artifacts to make the SR image of visually higher-resolution. In this paper, we propose a novel perceptual image super-resolution method that progressively generates visually high-quality results by constructing a stage-wise network. Specifically, the first phase concentrates on minimizing pixel-wise error and the second stage utilizes the features extracted by the previous stage to pursue results with better structural retention. The final stage employs fine structure features distilled by the second phase to produce more realistic results. In this way, we can maintain the pixel and structure level information in the perceptual image as much as possible. It is worth note that the proposed method can build three types of images in a feed-forward process. Also, we explore a new generator that adopts multi-scale hierarchical features fusion. Extensive experiments on benchmark datasets show that our approach is superior to the state-of-the-art methods. Code is available at https://github.com/Zheng222/PPON.

Index Terms—Perceptual image super-resolution, progressive related works learning, multi-scale hierarchical fusion.

Recently, due to the emergence of deep learning for other fields of computer vision studies, the introduction of convolutional neural networks (CNNs) has dramatically advanced the performance of SR. For instance, the pioneering work of super-resolution convolution neural network (SRCNN) proposed by Dong et al. [1], [2] employed three convolutional layers to approximate the nonlinear mapping function from interpolated LR image to HR image and outperformed most conventional SR methods. Various works [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14] that explore network architecture designs and training strategies have continuously improved SR performance in terms of quantitative quality such as peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR), root mean squared error (RMSE), and structural similarity (SSIM) [15]. However, these PSNR-oriented approaches still suffer from blurry results at large upsampling factors [16], [17], [18], [19], [20]. Specifically, the perceptual loss is proposed by Johnson et al. [16] which is a loss function that measures differences of the intermediate features of VGG19 [21] when taking the ground-truth and generated images as inputs. Legig et al. [17] extend this idea by adding an adversarial loss [22] and Sajjadi et al. [18] combine perceptual, adversarial and texture synthesis losses to produce sharper images with realistic textures. Wang et al. [23] incorporate semantic segmentation maps into a CNN-based SR network to generate realistic and visually pleasing textures. Although these methods can produce sharper images, they typically contain artifacts that are easily observed. Moreover, these approaches tend to improve visual quality without considering the substantial degradation of quantitative quality. Since the primary objective of the super-resolution task is to make the enlarged images resemble the ground-truth HR images as much as possible, it is necessary to maintain nature while guaranteeing the basic structural features that is related to pixel-to-pixel losses e.g., mean squared error (MSE), mean absolute error (MAE). At present, the most common way is to pre-train a PSNR-oriented model and then fine-tune this pre-trained model in company with a discriminator network and perceptual loss. Although this strategy helps to increase the stability of the training process, it still requires updating all parameters of the generator, which means an increase in training time.

In this paper, we propose a novel super-resolution method via the progressive perception-oriented network (PPON), which gradually generates images with pleasing visual quality. More specifically, inspired by [24], we propose hierarchical feature fusion block (HFFB) as the basic block (shown in Figure 3(a)), which utilizes multiple dilated convolutions with different rates to exploit abundant multi-scale information. In order to ease the training of very deep networks, we assemble our basic blocks by using residual-in-residual fashion [14], [20] named residual-in-residual fusion block (RRFB) as illustrated in Figure 3(b). To overcome the limitation of the previous perceptual-driven approaches and produce more realistic results, our method adopts three reconstruction modules: a content reconstruction module (CRM), a structure reconstruction module (SRM), and a photo-realism reconstruction module (PRM). The CRM as shown in Figure 1 mainly restores global information and minimizes pixel-by-pixel errors as done in previous PSNR-oriented approaches. The purpose of SRM is to maintain favorable structural information based on the result of CRM by using structural loss. Analogously, the PRM estimates the residual between the real image and the output of SRM with adversarial and perceptual losses. The
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diagrammatic sketch of this procedure is shown in Figure 2. Since the input of the perceptual features extraction module (PFEM) contains fruitful structure-related features and the generated perceptual image is based on the result of SRM, our PPON can synthesize a visually pleasing image that not only provides high-frequency components but also includes structural elements.

To achieve rapid training, we develop a step-by-step training mode, i.e., our basic model (illustrated in Figure 1) is trained first, then we freeze its parameters and train the sequential SFEM and SRM, and so on. The advantage is that when we train the perception-related modules (PFEM and PRM), very few parameters need to be updated. It differs from previous works that they require to optimize all parameters to produce photo-realistic results. Thus, training time will be shortened.

Overall, our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We develop a progressive photo-realism reconstruction approach, which can synthesize images with high fidelity (PSNR) and compelling visual effect. Specifically, we develop three reconstruction modules for completing multiple tasks, i.e., the content, structure, and perception reconstructions of an image. More broadly, we can also generate three images with different types in a feed-forward process, which is instructive to satisfy the requirements of various tasks.

- We design an effective training strategy according to the characteristic of our proposed progressive perception-oriented network (PPON), which is to fix the parameters of the previous training phase and utilize the features produced by this trained model to update few parameters at the current stage. By this way, the training of perception-oriented model is robust and fast.

- We also propose the basic model RFN mostly constructed by cascaded residual-in-residual fusion blocks (RRFBs), which achieves the state-of-the-art performance in terms of PSNR.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II provides a brief review of related SISR methods. Section III describes the proposed approach and loss functions in detail. In Section IV we explain the experiments conducted for this work, experimental comparisons with other state-of-the-art methods, and model analysis. In Section V we conclude the study.

Fig. 1. The network architecture of our basic PSNR-oriented model (Residual Fusion Network, namely RFN). We use 24 RRFBs for our experiments.

Fig. 2. The architecture of our progressive perception-oriented network (PPON). CFEM indicates content feature extraction module in Figure 1. CRM, SRM, and PRM represent content reconstruction module, structure reconstruction module, and photo-realism reconstruction module, respectively. SFEM denotes structural features extraction module and PFEM describes the perceptual features extraction part. In addition, ⊕ is the element-wise summation operator.

A. Deep learning-based super-resolution

The pioneering work was done by Dong et al. [11, 2], who proposed SRCNN for SISR task, which outperformed conventional algorithms. To further improve the accuracy, Kim et al. proposed two deep networks, i.e., VDSR [4], and DRCN [5], which apply global residual learning and recursive layer respectively to the SR problem. Tai et al. [7] developed a deep recursive residual network (DRRN) to reduce the model size of the very deep network by using parameter sharing mechanism. Another work designed by the authors is a very deep end-to-end persistent memory network (MemNet) [10] for image restoration task, which tackles the long-term dependency problem in the previous CNN architectures. The aforementioned methods need to take the interpolated LR images as inputs. It inevitably increases the computational complexity and often results in visible reconstruction artifacts [8].

For the sake of speeding up the execution time of deep learning-based SR approaches, Shi et al. [6] proposed an efficient sub-pixel convolutional neural network (ESPCN), which extracts features in the LR space and magnifies the spatial resolution at the end of the network by conducting an efficient sub-pixel convolution layer. Afterward, Dong et al. [3] developed a fast SRCNN (FSRCNN), which employs the transposed convolution to upscale and aggregate the LR space features. However, these two methods fail to learn complicated mapping due to the limitation of the model capacity. EDSR [9], the winner solution of NTIRE2017 [25], was presented by Lim et al.. This work is far superior in performance to previous models. To alleviate the difficulty of SR task with large scaling factors such as 8×, Lai et al. [8] proposed the LapSRN, which progressively reconstructs the multiple SR images with different scales in one feed-forward network. Tong et al. [11] presented a network for SR by employing dense skip connections, which demonstrated that the combination of features at different levels is helpful for improving SR performance. Recently, Zhang et al. [13] extended this idea and proposed a residual dense network (RDN),...
where the kernel is residual dense block (RDB) that extract abundant local features via dense connected convolutional layers. Furthermore, the authors proposed very deep residual channel attention networks (RCAN) [14] that verified the very deep network can improve SR performance and advantages of channel attention mechanism. To leverage the execution speed and performance, IDN [12] and CARN [26] were proposed by Hui et al. and Ahn et al., respectively. More concretely, Hui et al. constructed a deep but compact network, which mainly exploited and fused different types of features. And Ahn et al. designed a cascading network architecture. The main idea is to add multiple cascading connections from each intermediary layer to others. Such connections help this model performing SISR accurately and efficiently.

B. Super-resolution considering naturalness

SRGAN [17], as a landmark work in perceptual-driven SR, was proposed by Ledig et al. This approach is the first attempt to apply GAN [22] framework to SR, where the generator is composed of residual blocks [27]. To improve the naturalness of the images, perceptual and adversarial losses were used to train the model in SRGAN. Sajjadi et al. [18] explored the local texture matching loss and further improved the visual quality of the composite images. Park et al. [28] developed a GAN-based SISR method that produced realistic results by attaching an additional discriminator that works in the feature domain. Mechrez et al. [19] defined the Contextual loss that measured the similarity between the generated image and a target image by comparing the statistical distribution of the feature space. Wang et al. [20] enhanced SRGAN from three key components: network architecture, adversarial loss, and perceptual loss. A variant of Enhanced SRGAN (ESRGAN) won the first place in the PIRM2018-SR Challenge [29]. Choi et al. [30] introduced two quantitative score predictor networks to facilitate the generator improving the perceptual quality of the upscaled images.

II. PROPOSED METHOD

A. The proposed PSNR-oriented SR model

The single image super-resolution aims to estimate the SR image $I^{SR}$ from its LR counterpart $I^{LR}$. An overall structure of the proposed basic model (RFN) is shown in Figure 1. This network mainly consists of two parts: content feature extraction module (CFEM) and reconstruction part, where the first part extracts content features for conventional image SR task (pursuing high PSNR value) and the second part naturally reconstructs $I^{SR}$ through the front features related to the image content. The first procedure could be expressed by

$$F_c = H_{CFE}(I^{LR}),$$  (1)

where $H_{CFE}(\cdot)$ denotes content feature extractor, i.e., CFEM. Then, $F_c$ is sent to the content reconstruction module (CRM) $H_{CR}$.

$$I^{SR} = H_{CR}(F_c) = H_{RFN}(I^{LR}),$$  (2)

where $H_{RFN}(\cdot)$ denotes the function of our RFN.

The basic model is optimized with MAE loss function followed by the previous works [9], [13], [14]. Given a training set $\{I_i^{LR}, I_i^{HR}\}_{i=1}^N$, where $N$ is the number of training images, $I_i^{HR}$ is the ground-truth high resolution image of the low-resolution image $I_i^{LR}$, the loss function of our basic SR model is

$$L_{content}(\Theta_c) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| H_{RFN}(I_i^{LR}) - I_i^{HR} \right\|_1,$$  (3)

where $\Theta_c$ denotes the parameter set of our content-oriented branch (COBranch), i.e., RFN.

B. Progressive perception-oriented SR model

As depicted in Figure 2, based on the content features extracted by the CFEM, we design a SFEM to distill structure-related information for restore images with SRM. This process can be expressed by
\[ I_{SR}^{pr} = H_{PR} (F_p) + I_{SR}^{pr} = H_{PR} (H_{PFE} (F_c)) + I_{SR}^{pr}, \]

where \( H_{PR} (\cdot) \) and \( H_{PFE} (\cdot) \) denote the functions of PRM and PFEM, respectively. To this end, we employ the multi-scale structural similarity index (MS-SSIM) and multi-scale L1 as loss functions to optimize this branch. SSIM is defined as

\[
SSIM(x, y) = \frac{2\mu_x \mu_y + C_1}{\mu_x^2 + \mu_y^2 + C_1} \cdot \frac{2\sigma_{xy} + C_2}{\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + C_2}
\]

where \( \mu_x, \mu_y \) are the mean, \( \sigma_{xy} \) is the covariance of \( x \) and \( y \), and \( C_1, C_2 \) are constants. Given multiple scales through a process of \( M \) stages of downsampling, MS-SSIM is defined as

\[
MS-SSIM(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} c_{s_j} I_M^a (x, y) \cdot \frac{1}{M}
\]

where \( I_M^a \) and \( c_{s_j} \) are the term defined in Equation 5 at scale \( M \) and \( j \), respectively. From [31], we set \( \alpha = \beta_M \) and \( \beta = [0.0448, 0.2856, 0.3001, 0.2363, 0.1333] \). Therefore, the total loss function of our structure branch can be expressed by

\[
\mathcal{L}_{MS-SSIM} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} [1 - MS-SSIM (I_{i,HR}^{pr}, H_{SOB} (F_c^{i}))],
\]

where \( H_{SOB} (\cdot) \) represents the cascade of SFEM and SRM (light red area in Figure 5). \( F_c^i \) denotes content features (see Equation 1) corresponding to \( i \)-th training sample in a batch. Thus, the total loss function of this branch can be formulated as follows

\[
\mathcal{L}_{structure} (\Theta_s) = \mathcal{L}_{MS-L1} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{MS-SSIM},
\]

where \( \lambda \) is a scalar value to balance two losses, \( \Theta_s \) denotes the parameter set of structure-oriented branch (SOBranch). Here, we set \( M = 5 \), \( \omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_5 = [1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125, 0.125] \) through experience.

Similarly, to obtain photo-realistic images, we utilize structural-related features refined by SFEM and send them to our perception feature extraction module (PFEM). The merit of this practice is to avoid re-extracting features from the image domain and these extracted features contain abundant and superior quality structural information, which tremendously helps perceptual-oriented branch (POBranch) to achieve visually plausible SR images while maintaining the basic structure. Concretely, structural feature \( F_s \) is entered in PFEM

\[
I_{SR}^{pr} = H_{PR} (F_p) + I_{SR}^{pr} = H_{PR} (H_{PFE} (F_s)) + I_{SR}^{pr},
\]

where \( H_{PR} (\cdot) \) and \( H_{PFE} (\cdot) \) indicate PRM and PFEM as shown in Figure 2 respectively. For pursuing better visual effect, we adopt Relativistic GAN [32] as in [20]. Given a real image \( x_r \) and a fake one \( x_f \), the relativistic discriminator intends to estimate the probability that \( x_r \) is more realistic than \( x_f \).

In standard GAN, the discriminator can be defined, in term of the non-transformed layer \( C(x) \), as \( D(x) = \sigma(C(x)) \), where \( \sigma \) is sigmoid function. The Relativistic average Discriminator (RaD, denoted by \( D_{RaD} \)) can be formulated as \( D_{RaD} (x_r, x_f) = \sigma(C(x_r) - E_{x_f}[C(x_f)]) \), if \( x \) is real. Here, \( E_{x_f}[C(\cdot)] \) is the average of all fake data in a batch. The discriminator loss is defined by

\[
\mathcal{L}_{D}^{RaD} = -E_{x_r} \log(D_{RaD} (x_r, x_f)) - E_{x_f} \log(1 - D_{RaD} (x_r, x_f)).
\]

The corresponding adversarial loss for generator is

\[
\mathcal{L}_{G}^{RaD} = -E_{x_r} \log(D_{RaD} (x_r, x_f)) - E_{x_f} \log(D_{RaD} (x_f, x_r)),
\]

where \( x_f \) represents the generated images at the current perception-maximization stage, i.e., \( I_{SR}^{pr} \) in equation 9.

VGG loss that has been investigated in recent SR works [16, 17, 18, 20] for better visual quality is also introduced in this stage. We calculate the VGG loss based on the “conv5_4” layer of VGG19 [21],

\[
\mathcal{L}_{VGG} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i=1}^{C} \| \phi_i (I_{HR}) - \phi_i (I_{SR}^{pr}) \|_1,
\]

where \( V \) and \( C \) indicate the tensor volume and channel number of the feature maps, respectively, and \( \phi_i \) denotes the \( i \)-th channel of the feature maps extracted from the hidden layer of VGG19 model. Therefore, the total loss for the perception stage is:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{perception} (\Theta_p) = \mathcal{L}_{VGG} + \eta \mathcal{L}_{G}^{RaD},
\]

where \( \eta \) is the coefficients to balance these loss functions. And \( \Theta_p \) is the training parameters of POBranch.

C. Residual-in-residual fusion block

We now give more details about our proposed RRFB structure (see Figure 3(b)), which consists of multiple hierarchical feature fusion blocks (HFFB) (see Figure 3(b)). Different from the frequently-used residual block in SR, we intensify its representational ability by introducing the spatial pyramid of dilated convolutions [24]. Specifically, we develop \( K \times n \times n \) dilated convolutional kernels simultaneously, each with a dilation rate of \( k = \{1, \ldots, K\} \). Due to these dilated convolutions preserve different receptive fields, we can aggregate them to obtain multi-scale features. As shown in Figure 4, single dilated convolution with dilation rate of 3 (yellow block) looks sparse. To acquire effective receptive field, the feature maps obtained using kernels of different dilation rates are hierarchically added before concatenating them. A simple example is illustrated in Figure 4. For explaining this hierarchical feature fusion process clearly, the output of dilated convolution with dilation rate of \( k \) is denoted by \( f_k \).

In this way, the concatenated multi-scale features \( H_{ms} \) can be expressed by

\[
H_{ms} = [f_1 + f_2, \ldots, f_1 + f_2 + \ldots + f_K].
\]
After collecting these multi-scale features, we fuse them through a $1 \times 1$ convolution $\text{Conv}_{1 \times 1}$, that is $\text{Conv}_{1 \times 1}(\text{LReLU}(F_{ms}))$. Finally, the local skip connection with residual scaling is utilized to complete our HFFB.

Fig. 4. The diagrammatic sketch of multiple dilated convolutions addition. Taking the middle sub-figure as an example, $\text{conv}^{r} \times 3$ indicates $3 \times 3$ dilated convolution with dilation rate of 2. Under the same conditions of receptive field, $\text{conv}^{r} \times 3 + \text{conv}^{r} \times 3$ is more dense than $\text{conv}^{r} \times 3$.

III. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets and Training Details

We use the DIV2K dataset [25], which consists of 1,000 high-quality RGB images (800 training images, 100 validation images, and 100 test images) with 2K resolution. For increasing the diversity of training images, we also use the Flickr2K dataset [9] consisting of 2,650 2K resolution images. In this way, we have 3,450 high-resolution images for training purpose. LR training images are obtained by downscaling HR with a scaling factor of $4 \times$ images using bicubic interpolation function in MATLAB. The HR image patches with a size of $192 \times 192$ are randomly cropped from HR images as the input of our proposed model and the mini-batch size is set to 25. Data augmentation is performed on the 3,450 training images, which are randomly horizontal flip and 90 degree rotation. For evaluation, we use six widely used benchmark datasets: Set5 [33], Set14 [34], BSD100 [35], Urban100 [36], Manga109 [37] and the PIRM dataset [29]. The SR results are evaluated with PSNR, SSIM [15], learned perceptual image patch similarity (LPIPS) [38], and perceptual index (PI) on Y (luminance) channel, in which PI is based on the non-reference image quality measures of Ma et al. [39] and NIQE [40], i.e., $\text{PI} = \frac{1}{2}((10 - \text{Ma}) + \text{NIQE})$. The lower the values of LPIPS and PI, the better.

As depicted in Figure 5, the training process is divided into three phases. First, we train the COBranch with Equation 3. The initial learning rate is set to $2 \times 10^{-4}$, which is decreased by the factor of 2 for every 1000 epochs ($1.38 \times 10^5$ iterations). And then we fix the parameters of COBranch and only train the SOBranch through the loss function in Equation 8 with $\lambda = 1 \times 10^{-3}$. This process is illustrated in the second row of Figure 5. During this stage, the learning rate is set to $1 \times 10^{-4}$ and halved at every 250 epochs ($3.45 \times 10^4$ iterations). Similarly, we eventually only train the POBranch by Equation 13 with $\eta = 5 \times 10^{-3}$. The learning rate scheme is the same as the second phase. All the stages are trained by ADAM optimizer [41] with the momentum parameter $\beta_1 = 0.9$. We apply PyTorch framework to implement our model and train them using NVIDIA GTX 1080Ti GPUs.

We set the dilated convolutions number as $K = 8$ in the HFFB structure. All dilated convolutions have $3 \times 3$ kernels and 32 filters as shown in Figure 3(a). In each RRFB, we set HFFB number as 3. In COBranch, we apply 24 RRFBs. And only 2 RRFBs are employed in both SOBranch and POBranch. All standard convolutional layers have 64 filters and their kernel sizes are set to $3 \times 3$ expect for that at the end of HFFB, whose kernel size is $1 \times 1$. The residual scaling parameter $\alpha = 0.2$ and the negative scope of LReLU is set as 0.2.

B. Model analysis

Fig. 6. PSNR performance and number of parameters. The results are evaluated on Set5 dataset for a scaling factor of $4 \times$.

Model Parameters. We compare the trade-off between performance and model size in Figure 6. Among the nine models, RFN and RCAN show higher PSNR values than others. In particular, RFN records the best performance in Set5. It should be noted that RFN uses fewer parameters than
RCAN to achieve this performance. It means that RFN can better balance performance and model size.

| Dilated convolution | X | X | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hierarchical fusion | X | ✓ | X | ✓ | ✓ |
| PSNR on Set5 (1×)  | 31.68 | 31.69 | 31.63 | 31.72 |

**Study of dilation convolution and hierarchical feature fusion.** We remove the hierarchical feature fusion structure. Furthermore, in order to investigate the function of dilated convolution, we use ordinary convolutions. For validating quickly, only 1 RRFB is used in CFEM and this network is called RFNmini. We conduct the training process with the DIV2K dataset and the results are depicted in Table I. As the number of RRFB increases, the benefits will increase accumulatively (see in Table II).

**D. Comparisons with state-of-the-art methods**

We compare our RFN with 15 state-of-the-art methods: SRCNN [1], FSRCNN [3], VDSR [4], DRCN [5], LapSRN [8], MemNet [10], IDN [12], EDSR [9], SR-MDNF [42], D-DBPN [43], RDN [13], MSRN [44], CARN [26], RCAN [14], and SRFBN [45]. Table V shows quantitative comparisons for ×4 SR. It can be seen that our RFN performs the best in terms of PSNR on all the datasets. And the proposed S-RFN shows great advantages with regard to SSIM. In Figure 11, we present visual comparisons on different datasets. For image “img_011”, we observe that most of the compared methods cannot recover the lines and would suffer from blurred artifacts. In contrast, our RFN can slightly alleviate this phenomenon and restore more details.

Table V shows our quantitative evaluation results compared with 6 perceptual-driven state-of-the-arts approaches: SRGAN [17], ENet [18], CX [19], EPSR [47], NatSR [48], and ESRGAN [20]. The proposed PPON achieves the best in terms of LPIPS and keep the presentable PSNR values. For image “86” in Figures 12 the result generated by S-RFN is blurred but has the fine structure. Based on S-RFN, our PPON can synthesis realistic textures while retaining the nice structure. It also validates the effectiveness of the proposed progressive architecture.

**E. The choice of main evaluation metric**

We consider LPIPS [38] and PI [29] as our evaluation indices of perceptual image SR. As illustrated in Figure 13, we can obviously see that the PI score of EPSR3 (2.2666) is even better than HR (2.3885), but EPSR3 shows unnatural and lacks proper texture and structure. When observing the results of ESRGAN and our PPON, their perception effect is superior to that of EPSR3, which is exactly in accordance with corresponding LPIPS values. From the results of S-RFN and PPON, it can be demonstrated that both PI and LPIPS have the ability of distinguishing blurring image. From the images of EPSR3, SuperSR and ground-truth (HR), we can distinctly know that the lower PI value does not mean the better image quality. Compared with the image generated by ESRGAN [20], it is obvious that the proposed PPON get the
Fig. 7. Ablation study of progressive structure.

Fig. 8. The feature maps of CFEM, SFEM, and PFEM are visualized from left to right. Best viewed with zoom-in.

### TABLE III
Ablation Study of Progressive Structure.

| Item                      | w/o CRM & SOBranch | w/o SOBranch | PPON   |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------|
| Memory footprint (M)      | 7.357              | 6.311        | 6.317  |
| Training time (sec/epoch) | 1.063              | 541          | 567    |
| PIRM Val (PSNR / SSIM / LPIPS / PI) | 25.61 / 0.6802 / 0.1287 / 2.2857 | 26.32 / 0.6981 / 0.1250 / 2.2282 | 26.20 / 0.6995 / 0.1194 / 2.2353 |
| PIRM Test (PSNR / SSIM / LPIPS / PI) | 25.47 / 0.6667 / 0.1367 / 2.2055 | 26.16 / 0.6831 / 0.1309 / 2.1704 | 26.01 / 0.6831 / 0.1273 / 2.1511 |

### TABLE IV
Quantitative Evaluation Results in Terms of PSNR and SSIM. **Red** and **Blue** colors indicates the best and second best methods, respectively. Here, S-RFN is the combination of RFN and SOBRANCH.

| Method          | Set5  | Set14 | B100  | Urban100 | Manga109  |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-----------|
|                 | PSNR  | SSIM  | PSNR  | SSIM     | PSNR      | SSIM     |
| Bicubic         | 28.42 | 0.8104| 26.00 | 0.7027   | 25.96     | 0.6675   | 23.14     | 0.6577   | 24.89     | 0.7866   |
| SRCNN[1]        | 30.48 | 0.8628| 27.50 | 0.7513   | 26.90     | 0.7101   | 24.52     | 0.7221   | 27.58     | 0.8555   |
| FSRCNN[3]       | 30.72 | 0.8660| 27.61 | 0.7550   | 26.98     | 0.7150   | 24.62     | 0.7280   | 27.90     | 0.8610   |
| VDSR[4]         | 31.35 | 0.8838| 28.01 | 0.7674   | 27.29     | 0.7251   | 25.18     | 0.7524   | 28.87     | 0.8865   |
| DR CN[5]        | 31.53 | 0.8854| 28.02 | 0.7670   | 27.23     | 0.7235   | 25.14     | 0.7510   | 28.93     | 0.8854   |
| LapSNR[8]       | 31.54 | 0.8852| 28.09 | 0.7700   | 27.32     | 0.7275   | 25.21     | 0.7562   | 29.02     | 0.8900   |
| MemNet[10]      | 31.74 | 0.8893| 28.26 | 0.7723   | 27.40     | 0.7281   | 25.50     | 0.7630   | 29.42     | 0.8942   |
| IDN[12]         | 31.82 | 0.8903| 28.25 | 0.7730   | 27.41     | 0.7297   | 25.41     | 0.7632   | 29.41     | 0.8936   |
| EDSR[9]         | 32.46 | 0.8968| 28.80 | 0.7876   | 27.71     | 0.7420   | 26.64     | 0.8033   | 31.02     | 0.9148   |
| SRMDNF[42]      | 31.96 | 0.8925| 28.35 | 0.7772   | 27.49     | 0.7337   | 25.68     | 0.7731   | 30.09     | 0.9042   |
| D-DBPN[43]      | 32.47 | 0.8980| 28.82 | 0.7860   | 27.72     | 0.7400   | 26.38     | 0.7946   | 30.91     | 0.9137   |
| RDN[13]         | 32.47 | 0.8990| 28.81 | 0.7871   | 27.72     | 0.7419   | 26.61     | 0.8028   | 31.00     | 0.9151   |
| MSRN[44]        | 32.07 | 0.8903| 28.60 | 0.7751   | 27.52     | 0.7273   | 26.04     | 0.7896   | 30.17     | 0.9034   |
| CARN[26]        | 32.13 | 0.8937| 28.60 | 0.7806   | 27.58     | 0.7349   | 26.07     | 0.7837   | 30.47     | 0.9084   |
| RCAN[14]        | 32.63 | 0.9002| 28.87 | 0.7889   | 27.77     | 0.7436   | 26.82     | 0.8087   | 31.22     | 0.9173   |
| SRFBN[15]       | 32.47 | 0.8983| 28.81 | 0.7868   | 27.72     | 0.7409   | 26.60     | 0.8015   | 31.15     | 0.9160   |
| SAN[45]         | 32.64 | 0.9003| 28.92 | 0.7888   | 27.78     | 0.7436   | 26.79     | 0.8068   | 31.18     | 0.9169   |
| RFN(Ours)       | 32.71 | 0.9007| 28.95 | 0.7901   | 27.83     | 0.7449   | 27.01     | 0.8135   | 31.59     | 0.9199   |
| S-RFN(Ours)     | 32.66 | 0.9022| 28.86 | 0.7946   | 27.74     | 0.7515   | 26.95     | 0.8169   | 31.51     | 0.9211   |
better visual effect with more structure information, which is corresponding to the lower LPIPS value. Due to the PI (non-reference measure) is not sensitive to deformation through the experiment and cannot reflect the similarity with ground-truth, we take LPIPS as our primary perceptual measure and PI as a secondary metric.

Besides, we performed a MOS (mean opinion score) test to validate the effectiveness of our PPON further. Specifically, we collect 16 raters to assign an integral score from 1 (bad quality) to 5 (excellent quality). To ensure the reliability of the results, we provide the raters with test and original HR images at the same time. The ground-truth images are set to 5, and the raters then score the test images based on it. The average MOS results are shown in Table VI.

F. The influence of training patch size

In ESRGAN [20], the authors mentioned that larger training patch size costs more training time and consumes more computing resources. Thus, they used 192 × 192 for PSNR-oriented methods and 128 × 128 for perceptual-driven methods. In our main manuscript, we train the COBranch, SOBranch, and POBranch with 192 × 192 image patches. Here, we further explore the influence of larger patches in the perceptual image generation stage. It is important to note that training perceptual-driven model requires more GPU memory and larger computing resources than the PSNR-oriented model since the VGG model and discriminator need to be loaded during the training of the former. Therefore, larger patches (192 × 192) are hard to be used in optimizing ESRGAN [20] due to their huge generator and discriminator to be updated. Thanks to our POBranch only containing very few parameters, we employ 192 × 192 training patches and achieve the better results as shown in Table VII. With regard to the discriminators, we illustrate them in Figure 14. For a fair comparison with the ESRGAN [20], we retrain our POBranch with 128 × 128 patches and provide the results in Table VII.

IV. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a progressive perception-oriented network (PPON) for better perceptual image SR. Concretely, three branches are developed to learn the content, structure, and perceptual details, respectively. By exerting stage-by-stage
Fig. 11. Visual comparisons for 4× SR with RFN on Urban100 and Manga109 datasets.
| BSD100 (4x) | HR ENet [18] CX [19] EPSR [47] ESRGAN [20] S-RFN (Ours) PPON (Ours) | PSNR/LPIPS |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 10035      | 19.869/0.1986                                   | 23.70/0.278 |
| 8023       | 24.169/0.1798                                   | 24.02/0.125 |
| 76          | 25.585/0.1666                                   | 25.55/0.131 |
| 43          | 25.045/0.1580                                   | 25.36/0.160 |
| 223         | 19.920/0.2776                                   | 23.28/0.258 |
| 258         | 24.838/0.1984                                   | 24.83/0.258 |

**Fig. 12.** Qualitative comparisons of perceptual-driven SR methods with our results at scaling factor of 4. Here, SuperSR is the variant of ESRGAN and it won the first place in the PIRM2018-SR Challenge.
TABLE V
RESULTS ON PUBLIC BENCHMARK DATASETS, PIRM_Val, AND PIRM_Test FOR EXISTING PERCEPTUAL QUALITY SPECIFIC METHODS AND OUR PROPOSED PPON. RED COLOR INDICATES THE BEST PERFORMANCE AND BLUE COLOR INDICATES THE SECOND BEST PERFORMANCE.

| Dataset | Scores | SRGAN [17] | ENet [15] | CX [19] | EPSR2 [47] | EPSR1 [47] | NatSR [48] | ESRGAN [20] | PPON (Ours) |
|---------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Set5    | PSNR   | 29.43      | 28.57     | 29.12  | 31.24     | 29.59      | 31.00     | 30.47     | 30.84      |
|         | SSIM   | 0.8356     | 0.8103    | 0.8323 | 0.8650    | 0.8415     | 0.8617    | 0.8518    | 0.8561     |
|         | PI     | 3.3554     | 2.9261    | 3.2947 | 4.1123    | 3.2571     | 4.1875    | 3.7550    | 3.4590     |
|         | LPIPS  | 0.0837     | 0.1014    | 0.0806 | 0.0978    | 0.0889     | 0.0943    | 0.0748    | 0.0664     |
| Set14   | PSNR   | 26.12      | 23.77     | 26.06  | 27.77     | 26.36      | 27.53     | 26.28     | 26.97      |
|         | SSIM   | 0.6958     | 0.6782    | 0.7001 | 0.7440    | 0.7097     | 0.7356    | 0.6984    | 0.7194     |
|         | PI     | 2.8816     | 3.0176    | 2.7590 | 3.0246    | 2.6981     | 3.1138    | 2.9259    | 2.7741     |
|         | LPIPS  | 0.1488     | 0.1620    | 0.1452 | 0.1861    | 0.1576     | 0.1765    | 0.1329    | 0.1176     |
| B100    | PSNR   | 25.18      | 24.94     | 24.59  | 26.28     | 25.19      | 26.45     | 25.32     | 25.74      |
|         | SSIM   | 0.6409     | 0.6266    | 0.6440 | 0.6905    | 0.6468     | 0.6835    | 0.6514    | 0.6684     |
|         | PI     | 2.3513     | 2.9078    | 2.2501 | 2.7458    | 2.1990     | 2.7746    | 2.4789    | 2.3775     |
|         | LPIPS  | 0.1843     | 0.2013    | 0.1881 | 0.2474    | 0.2474     | 0.2115    | 0.1614    | 0.1597     |
| PIRM_Val| PSNR   | N/A        | 25.07     | 25.41  | 27.35     | 25.46      | 27.03     | 25.18     | 26.20      |
|         | SSIM   | N/A        | 0.6459    | 0.6747 | 0.7277    | 0.6657     | 0.7199    | 0.6596    | 0.6995     |
|         | PI     | N/A        | 2.6876    | 2.1310 | 2.3880    | 2.0688     | 2.4758    | 2.5550    | 2.2353     |
|         | LPIPS  | N/A        | 0.1667    | 0.1447 | 0.1750    | 0.1869     | 0.1648    | 0.1443    | 0.1194     |
| PIRM_Test| PSNR  | N/A        | 24.95     | 25.31  | 27.04     | 25.35      | 26.95     | 25.04     | 26.01      |
|         | SSIM   | N/A        | 0.6306    | 0.6636 | 0.7068    | 0.6535     | 0.7090    | 0.6454    | 0.6831     |
|         | PI     | N/A        | 2.7232    | 2.1133 | 2.2752    | 2.0131     | 2.3772    | 2.4356    | 2.1511     |
|         | LPIPS  | N/A        | 0.1776    | 0.1519 | 0.1739    | 0.1902     | 0.1712    | 0.1523    | 0.1273     |

Fig. 13. A visual comparison with the state-of-the-art perceptual image SR algorithms.

Fig. 14. The network structure of the discriminators. The output size is scaled down by stride 2, and the parameter of LReLU is 0.2.
training scheme, we can steadily get the promising results. It is worth mentioning that these three branches are not independent. In other words, extracted features and output images of the content-oriented branch can be exploited by a structure-oriented branch. Extensive experiments on both traditional SR and perceptual SR demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed PPON.
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