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Sparse linear models

Signal: $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$

Dictionary:

$D = [d_1, \ldots, d_p] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$

$x \approx \alpha_1 d_1 + \alpha_2 d_2 + \ldots + \alpha_p d_p = D\alpha, \text{ with } |\alpha|_0 \ll p$

(Olshausen and Field, 1997; Chen et al., 1999; Mallat, 1999; Elad and Aharon, 2006)
(Kavukcuoglu et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2009; Yang et al., 09; Boureau et al., 2010)
Sparse coding and dictionary learning: A hierarchy of optimization problems

\[ \min_\alpha \frac{1}{2} |x - D\alpha|^2 \]

Least squares
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Learning for a task
Learning structures

\[ \min_\alpha \frac{1}{2} |x - D\alpha|^2 + \lambda |\alpha|_0 \]
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\[ \min_\alpha \frac{1}{2} |x - D\alpha|^2 + \lambda \psi(\alpha) \]
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\[ \min_{D \in C, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |x_i - D\alpha_i|^2 + \lambda \psi(\alpha_i) \right] \]
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\[ \min_{D \in C, W, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ f(x_i, D, W, \alpha_i) + \lambda \psi(\alpha_i) \right] \]
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Learning structures

\[ \min_{D \in C, W, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ f(x_i, D, W, \alpha_i) + \lambda \sum_{1 \leq k \leq q} \psi(d_k) \right] \]

Dictionary learning
Learning for a task
Learning structures
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Important messages

• Patch-based approaches achieve state-of-the-art results for many image processing tasks.

• Dictionary can be learned on the data you want to restore itself.

• Sparse coding is well adapted to data that admit sparse representations.

• Sparse coding is for sparse data only.

• It is not compressed sensing (Candes’06).
Outline

• Sparse linear models of image data
• Unsupervised dictionary learning
• Non-local sparse models for image restoration
• Learning discriminative dictionaries for image classification
• Task-driven dictionary learning and its applications
• Ongoing work
Sparse coding

• The $l_0$ version:
  \[
  \min_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} \| x - D\alpha \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \alpha \|_0
  \]
  NP-hard, greedy approximate algorithms

• The $l_1$ version:
  \[
  \min_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} \| x - D\alpha \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \alpha \|_1
  \]
  convex, exact algorithms
Finding your way in the sparse coding literature is not easy. The literature is vast, redundant, sometimes confusing and many papers are claiming victory.

The main classes of methods are:

- greedy procedures [Mallat and Zhang, 1993], [Weisberg, 1980],
- homotopy [Osborne et al., 2000], [Efron et al., 2004], [Markowitz, 1956],
- soft-thresholding based methods [Fu, 1998], [Daubechies et al., 2004], [Friedman et al., 2007], [Nesterov, 2007], [Beck and Teboulle, 2009],
- reweighted-$\ell_2$ methods [Daubechies et al., 2009],
- active-set methods [Roth and Fischer, 2008].
Matching Pursuit
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$$\alpha = (0, 0.24, 0.75)$$
Matching Pursuit

\[ \alpha = (0, 0.24, 0.65) \]
The $l_1$ norm and sparsity
LARS (Efron et al., 2004)
Dictionary learning

• Given some loss function, e.g.,

\[ L ( x, D ) = \min_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} | x - D\alpha |^2_2 + \lambda |\alpha|_1 \]

• One usually minimizes, given some data \( x_i, i = 1, ..., n \), the empirical risk:

\[ \min_D f_n ( D ) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} L ( x_i, D ) \]

• But, one would really like to minimize the expected one, that is:

\[ \min_D f ( D ) = \mathbb{E}_x [ L ( x, D ) ] \]

(Bottou & Bousquet '08 → Stochastic gradient descent)
Online sparse matrix factorization
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, Sapiro, ICML’09, JMLR’10)

Problem:
\[
\min_D f(D) = \mathbb{E}_x [ L(x, D) ]
\]

\[
\min_{D \in C, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |x_i - D\alpha_i|_2^2 + \lambda |\alpha_i|_1 \right]
\]

Algorithm:
Iteratively draw one random training sample \( x_t \)
and minimize the quadratic surrogate function:
\[
g_t(D) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq t} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |x_i - D\alpha_i|_2^2 + \lambda |\alpha_i|_1 \right]
\]

(Lars/Lasso for sparse coding, block-coordinate descent with warm
restarts for dictionary updates, mini-batch extensions, etc.)
Online sparse matrix factorization
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, Sapiro, ICML’09, JMLR’10)

Problem:
\[
\min_D f(D) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ L(x, D) \right]
\]
\[
\min_{D \in C, A} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| X - DA \|_F^2 + \lambda \| A \|_1 \right]
\]

Algorithm:
Iteratively draw one random training sample \( x_t \) and minimize the quadratic surrogate function:
\[
g_t(D) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq t} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| x_i - D \alpha_i \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \alpha_i \|_1 \right]
\]
(Lars/Lasso for sparse coding, block-coordinate descent with warm restarts for dictionary updates, mini-batch extensions, etc.)
Online sparse matrix factorization
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, Sapiro, ICML’09, JMLR’10)

Proposition:
Under mild assumptions, $D_t$ converges with probability one to a stationary point of the dictionary learning problem.

Proof: Convergence of empirical processes (van der Vaart’98) and, a la Bottou’98, convergence of quasi martingales (Fisk’65).

Extensions:
• Non negative matrix factorization (Lee & Seung’01)
• Non negative sparse coding (Hoyer’02)
• Sparse principal component analysis (Jolliffe et al.’03; Zou et al.’06; Zass & Shashua’07; d’Aspremont et al.’08; Witten et al.’09)
Performance evaluation

Three datasets constructed from 1,250,000 Pascal’06 patches (1,000,000 for training, 250,000 for testing):

- **A**: $8 \times 8$ b&w patches, 256 atoms.
- **B**: $12 \times 16 \times 3$ color patches, 512 atoms.
- **C**: $16 \times 16$ b&w patches, 1024 atoms.

Two variants of our algorithm:

- Online version with different choices of parameters.
- Batch version on different subsets of training data.

**Online vs batch**

**Online vs stochastic gradient descent**
Sparse PCA: Adding sparsity on the atoms

Three datasets:
- **D**: 2429 $19 \times 19$ images from MIT-CBCL #1.
- **E**: 2414 $192 \times 168$ images from extended Yale B.
- **F**: 100,000 $16 \times 16$ patches from Pascal VOC’06.

Three implementations:
- Hoyer’s Matlab implementation of NNMF (Lee & Seung’01).
- Hoyer’s Matlab implementation of NNSC (Hoyer’02).
- Our C++/Matlab implementation of SPCA (elastic net on D).

**SPCA vs NNMF**

**SPCA vs NNSC**
Inpainting a 12MP image with a dictionary learned from 7x10^6 patches in 500s (Mairal et al., 2009)
State of the art in image denoising

Dictionary learning for denoising (Elad & Aharon’06; Mairal, Elad & Sapiro’08)

$$\min_{D \in C, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \| x_i - D \alpha_i \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \alpha_i \|_1 \right]$$

$$x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_i D \alpha_i$$

Non-local means filtering (Buades et al.’05)
State of the art in image denoising

BM3D (Dabov et al.'07)

Non-local means filtering (Buades et al.'05)

Dictionary learning for denoising (Elad & Aharon'06; Mairal, Elad & Sapiro'08)

\[
\min_{D \in C, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left| x_i - D \alpha_i \right|_2^2 + \lambda \left| \alpha_i \right|_1 \right]
\]

\[
x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_i D \alpha_i
\]
Non-local sparse models for image restoration
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, Sapiro, Zisserman, ICCV'09)

\[
\min_{D \in C, A_1, \ldots, A_n} \sum_i \left[ \sum_{j \in S_i} \frac{1}{2} \| x_j - D \alpha_{ij} \|_F^2 \right] + \lambda \| A_i \|_{p,q}
\]

\[|A|_{p,q} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\alpha^i|_q^p \quad (p,q) = (1,2) \text{ or } (0,\infty)\]
PSNR comparison between our method (LSSC) and Portilla et al.'03 [23]; Roth & Black'05 [25]; Elad& Aharon’06 [12]; and Dabov et al.’07 [8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σ</th>
<th>[23]</th>
<th>[25]</th>
<th>[12]</th>
<th>[8]</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td><strong>37.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>33.76</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td><strong>34.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>31.99</td>
<td><strong>32.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td><strong>30.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td><strong>29.74</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td><strong>26.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td><strong>23.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demosaicking experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Im.</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>LPA</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td><strong>41.36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>42.03</td>
<td><strong>42.24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td><strong>44.24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.93</td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td><strong>44.34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>35.55</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td><strong>35.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>39.21</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td><strong>41.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSNR comparison between our method (LSSC) and Gunturk et al.’02 [AP]; Zhang & Wu’05 [DL]; and Paliy et al.’07 [LPA] on the Kodak PhotoCD data.
Real noise (Canon Powershot G9, 1600 ISO)
Learning discriminative dictionaries with $l_0$ constraints

(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, Sapiro, Zisserman, CVPR’08)

\[ \alpha^*(x,D) = \text{Argmin}_{\alpha} \| x - D\alpha \|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |\alpha|_0 \leq L \]

\[ R^*(x,D) = \| x - D\alpha^* \|_2^2 \]

Orthogonal matching pursuit
(Mallat & Zhang’93, Tropp’04)


\[ \min_D \sum_l R^*(x_l,D) \]

Discrimination:

\[ \min_{D_1,\ldots,D_n} \sum_{i,l} C_i^\lambda \left[ R^*(x_l,D_{1}),\ldots,R^*(x_l,D_{n}) \right] + \lambda \gamma R^*(x_l,D_i) \]

(Both MOD and K-SVD versions with truncated Newton iterations.)
Texture classification results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>[28]</th>
<th>[17]</th>
<th>[34]</th>
<th>[16]</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.96</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. | 18.4 | 10.9 | NA   | 10.16| 9.97| 10.41| 7.34| 4.50|
Pixel-level classification results

Qualitative results, Graz 02 data

Reconstructive vs discriminative dictionaries

Reconstructive

Discriminative

Bicycle

Background
Learning discriminative dictionaries with \( l_1 \) constraints

(Mairal, Leordeanu, Bach, Hebert, Ponce, ECCV’08)

\[
\alpha^*(x,D) = \text{Argmin}_{\alpha} | x - D\alpha |_2^2 \text{ s.t. } |\alpha|_1 \leq L
\]

\[
R^*(x,D) = | x - D\alpha^* |_2^2
\]

Reconstruction (Lee, Battle, Rajat, Ng’07):

\[
\min_D \sum_l R^*(x_l,D)
\]

Discrimination:

\[
\min_{D_1,\ldots,D_n} \sum_{i,l} C_i^{\lambda} [R^*(x_l,D_1),\ldots,R^*(x_l,D_n)] + \lambda \gamma R^*(x_l,D_i)
\]

(Partial dictionary update with Newtown iterations on the dual problem; partial fast sparse coding with projected gradient descent.)
Patch classification with learned dictionaries

Signal input → Subsampling → Sparse coding → Classifier 1 → Classifier 2 → Classifier 3 → Linear classifier
Edge detection results

Quantitative results on the Berkeley segmentation dataset and benchmark (Martin et al., ICCV’01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Human labeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>(Maire et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>(Aerbelaez, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>(Dollar et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Us – no post-processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>(Martin et al., 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Color gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Random</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparaison with Leordeanu et al. (2007) on Pascal'07 benchmark. Mean error rate reduction: 33%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Us + L'07</th>
<th>L'07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeroplane</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>59.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Us + L'07</th>
<th>L'07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**
- **Input edges:**
  - Aeroplane
  - Boat
  - Cat
  - Cow
  - Horse
  - Motorbike
  - Sheep
  - Monitor

- **Bike edges:**
  - None

- **Bottle edges:**
  - None

- **People edges:**
  - None
Task-driven dictionary learning
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, PAMI’10, in press)

\[
\min_{W,D} f(W,D) = \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [L(y, W, \alpha^*(x, D))] + \nu \|W\|_F^2
\]

with \(\alpha^*(x,D) = \text{Argmin}_{\alpha} |x - D\alpha|^2 + \lambda |\alpha|_1 + \mu |\alpha|_2^2\)

(Mairal et al.’08; Bradley & Bagnell’09; Boureau et al.’10; Yang et al.’10)

• **Applications:** Regression, classification.
• **Extensions:** Learning linear transforms of the input data, semi-supervised learning.
• **Proposition:** Under mild assumptions, \(f\) is differentiable, and its gradient can be written in closed form as an expectation.
• **Algorithm:** Stochastic gradient descent.
Authentic

Fake

(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010) Data courtesy of James Hughes & Daniel Rockmore
Data courtesy of James Hughes & Daniel Rockmore
A common architecture for image classification

Filtering
- SIFT at keypoints
- dense gradients
- dense SIFT

Coding
- vector quantization
- vector quantization
- sparse coding

Pooling
- whole image, mean
- coarse grid, mean
- spatial pyramid, max

Idea: Replace k-means by sparse coding (Yang et al., CVPR'09; Boureau et al., CVPR'10, ICML'10; Yang et al., CVPR'10).
## Learning dictionaries for image classification

(Boureau, LeCun, Bach, Ponce, CVPR’10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Caltech-101, 30 training examples</th>
<th>15 Scenes, 100 training examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Pool</td>
<td>Max Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard quantization, linear kernel</td>
<td>51.4 ± 0.9 [256]</td>
<td>64.3 ± 0.9 [256]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard quantization, intersection kernel</td>
<td>64.2 ± 1.0 [256] (1)</td>
<td>64.3 ± 0.9 [256]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft quantization, linear kernel</td>
<td>57.9 ± 1.5 [1024]</td>
<td>69.0 ± 0.8 [256]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft quantization, intersection kernel</td>
<td>66.1 ± 1.2 [512] (2)</td>
<td>70.6 ± 1.0 [1024]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparse codes, linear kernel</td>
<td>61.3 ± 1.3 [1024]</td>
<td>71.5 ± 1.1 [1024] (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparse codes, intersection kernel</td>
<td>70.3 ± 1.3 [1024]</td>
<td>71.8 ± 1.0 [1024] (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Single - feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Caltech-15 tr.</th>
<th>Caltech-30 tr.</th>
<th>Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiman et al. [3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain et al. [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazebnik et al. [12]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Gemert et al. [27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. [31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. [31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. [32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou et al. [33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spheres, supervised dictionary learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsup</th>
<th>Discr[1024]</th>
<th>Unsup</th>
<th>Discr[2048]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>83.6 ± 0.4</td>
<td>84.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>84.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>85.6 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersect</td>
<td>84.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>84.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td>84.6 ± 0.4</td>
<td>85.1 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yang et al. (2009) have won the 2009 Pascal VOC challenge with this type of technique.
Non-blind deblurring *(Couzinie-Devy, Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSNR input image</th>
<th>Cameraman</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richardson-Lucy [20]</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparse gradient [14]</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabov et al. [3]</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear + Dictionary</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-blind deblurring \textit{(Couzinie-Devy, Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Kernel & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
(Levin et al., 2008) & 7.92 & 8.20 & 7.58 & 12.29 \\
Ours & 8.47 & 7.85 & 7.54 & 5.93 \\
\hline
(Levin et al., 2008) & 9.52 & 13.02 & 12.94 & 11.38 \\
Ours & 9.91 & 8.43 & 8.51 & 7.20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{BUT}

on anisotropic kernels
\textit{(Levin et al., 2009)}
Digital zoom (Couzinie-Devy, Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cubic spline</th>
<th>Yang et al.’09</th>
<th>Yu et al.’10</th>
<th>Ours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>34.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>34.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>37.02</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>40.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Couzinie-Devy et al., 2010)
Inverse halftoning
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010)
Inverse halftoning
(Mairal, Bach, Ponce, 2010)
## PSNR Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIHT2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WInHD</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA-ICI</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-DCT</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td><strong>26.2</strong></td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td><strong>33.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSNR comparison between our method and Kite et al.’00 [FIHT2]; Neelamini et al.’09 [WInHD]; Foi et al.’04 [LPA-ICI]; and Dabov et al.’06 [SA-DCT].
Epitomic dictionaries
(Benoit, Mairal, Bach, Ponce, CVPR'10)

Epitomes: (Jojic, Frey, Kannan, 2003)
Related ideas: (Aharon & Elad, 2007; Hyvarinen & Hoyer, 2001; Kavukcuoglu et al., 2009; Zeiler et al., 2010)
Denoising experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>32.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td><strong>36.05</strong></td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>31.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>33.43</td>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td><strong>29.24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>29.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td><strong>34.21</strong></td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td><strong>30.71</strong></td>
<td>29.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>28.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lena</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td><strong>35.44</strong></td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td><strong>31.37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td><strong>33.67</strong></td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>31.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>31.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>30.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td><strong>33.66</strong></td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td><strong>29.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>29.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td><strong>31.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.41</strong></td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>28.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppers</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td><strong>34.46</strong></td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td><strong>30.93</strong></td>
<td>29.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td><strong>29.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>29.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISD = (Aharon & Elad’08)
DL=flat dict. learning
Proximal methods for sparse hierarchical dictionary learning (Jenatton, Mairal, Obozinski, Bach, ICML'10)
Proximal methods for sparse hierarchical dictionary learning (Jenatton, Mairal, Obozinski, Bach, ICML'10)
Network flow algorithms for structured sparsity
(Mairal, Jenatton, Obozinski, Bach, NIPS’11)
SPArse Modeling software (SPAMS)

http://www.di.ens.fr/willow/SPAMS/

Tutorials on sparse coding and dictionary learning for image analysis

ICCV’09: www.di.ens.fr/~mairal/tutorial_iccv09/
NIPS’09: www.di.ens.fr/~fbach/nips2009tutorial/
CVPR’10: www.di.ens.fr/~mairal/tutorial_cvpr2010/
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