

## C3: High-performance and low-complexity neural compression from a single image or video

Hyunjik Kim\*, Matthias Bauer\*, Lucas Theis, Jonathan Richard Schwarz, Emilien Dupont\*  
Google DeepMind

\*Equal contribution

Corresponding authors: {hyunjikk, msbauer, edupont}@google.com

### Abstract

*Most neural compression models are trained on large datasets of images or videos in order to generalize to unseen data. Such generalization typically requires large and expressive architectures with a high decoding complexity. Here we introduce C3, a neural compression method with strong rate-distortion (RD) performance that instead overfits a small model to each image or video separately. The resulting decoding complexity of C3 can be an order of magnitude lower than neural baselines with similar RD performance. C3 builds on COOL-CHIC (Ladune et al. [43]) and makes several simple and effective improvements for images. We further develop new methodology to apply C3 to videos. On the CLIC2020 image benchmark, we match the RD performance of VTM, the reference implementation of the H.266 codec, with less than 3k MACs/pixel for decoding. On the UVG video benchmark, we match the RD performance of the Video Compression Transformer (Mentzer et al. [59]), a well-established neural video codec, with less than 5k MACs/pixel for decoding.*

### 1. Introduction

Most neural compression models are based on autoencoders [5, 78], with an encoder mapping an image to a quantized latent vector and a decoder mapping the latent vector back to an approximate reconstruction of the image. To be practically useful as codecs, these models must *generalize*, *i.e.*, the decoder should be able to approximately reconstruct any natural image. Such a decoding function is likely to be complex and expensive to compute. Indeed, while most neural codecs enjoy very strong rate-distortion (RD) performance [16, 31, 38], their decoding complexity can make them impractical for many use cases, particularly when hardware is constrained, *e.g.*, on mobile devices [45, 82]. As a re-

JRS is now at Harvard University.

Detailed author contributions are at the end of the paper.




Figure 1. Rate-distortion performance (BD-rate) vs. decoding complexity on the Kodak image benchmark. Our method, C3, achieves a better trade-off than existing neural codecs.

sult, designing low complexity codecs that offer strong RD performance is one of the major open problems in neural compression [88].

Recently, an alternative approach to neural compression called COIN was proposed [20]. Instead of generalizing across images, COIN *overfits* a neural network to a *single* image. The quantized weights of this neural network (often referred to as a neural field [85]) are then transmitted as a compressed code for the image. As the decoder only needs to reconstruct a single image, the resulting network is significantly smaller than traditional neural decoders [6, 16, 63], reducing the decoding complexity by orders of magnitude. However, while the decoding complexity of COIN is low, its RD performance is poor, and it is therefore not a viable alternative to other codecs.

More recently, Ladune et al. [43] introduced COOL-CHIC which, in addition to learning a decoder per image like COIN, also learns an *entropy* model per image. This led to significantly improved RD performance while maintaining low decoding complexity. A recent extension of




Figure 2. Decoding the bitstream into an image with COOL-CHIC and C3. **A.** A latent entry  $\hat{z}_{ij}^n$  (■) is autoregressively decoded by applying the entropy network  $g_\psi$  to the context context  $(\mathbf{z}^n; (i, j))$  (■). **B.** The decoded latent grids at multiple resolutions are first upsampled and then decoded into image space using the synthesis network  $f_\theta$ . Figure adapted from Leguay et al. [48].

COOL-CHIC that we refer to as COOL-CHICv2 [48] exceeds the RD performance of the widely used BPG/HEVC codec [8, 76] while only requiring 2.3k MACs/pixel at decoding time, an order of magnitude less than the most efficient neural codecs [29] (decoding complexity is measured in number of multiply-accumulate (MAC) operations, cf. App. B for details). Despite these impressive results, the performance of COOL-CHIC still falls short of the latest classical codecs such as VTM [11]. Further, COOL-CHIC has not been applied to video, where low decoding cost is of greater importance as fast decoding is required to maintain a satisfactory frame rate for streaming.

In this paper, we introduce C3, a neural compression method that builds on COOL-CHIC but substantially improves its RD performance while maintaining a low decoding complexity (see Fig. 1). More specifically, we propose a series of simple and effective improvements to the optimization, quantization, and architecture of COOL-CHIC. These changes result in a 22.2% reduction in BD-rate [9] compared to COOL-CHICv2 while matching VTM on the CLIC2020 benchmark [79]. *To the best of our knowledge, C3 is the first neural compression method to achieve RD performance matching VTM on images while maintaining very low decoding complexity (less than 3k MACs/pixel).* Further, C3 is the state of the art among neural codecs obtained from a single image.

Going beyond COOL-CHIC, which is only applied to images, we also extend C3 to videos, making several crucial methodological changes enabling the application of our method to this modality. On the UVG benchmark [60], we demonstrate strong RD performance that matches VCT [59] while requiring 4.4k MACs/pixel, less than 0.1% of VCT’s decoding complexity. We believe this is a promising step towards efficient neural codecs trained on a single video.

## 2. Background: COOL-CHIC

Autoencoder based neural compression methods train an encoder network (also known as analysis transform) to compress an image  $\mathbf{x}$  into a quantized latent  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ , and a corresponding decoder network (also known as synthesis transform) to reconstruct  $\mathbf{x}$  from  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ . Typically, the latent  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  is the only image-dependent component and is encoded into a bitstream using a shared entropy model  $P$  [88].

In contrast, COOL-CHIC [43] and COOL-CHICv2 [48] are methods for single image compression, in which all components are fit to each image separately. In the following we provide further details on COOL-CHIC. See Fig. 2 for an overview.

**Overview.** At a high level, the COOL-CHIC model consists of three components (cf. Fig. 2): (i) a set of latent grids at different spatial resolutions  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N)$ , (ii) a synthesis transform  $f_\theta$  to decode these latents into an image, and (iii) an autoregressive entropy-coding network  $g_\psi$  that is used to convert the latents into a bitstream. Because the networks do not need to be general, they can be very small, which allows for low decoding complexity. Instead of an analysis transform, COOL-CHIC uses optimization to jointly fit the latents, the synthesis transform and the entropy network per image. The gradient-based optimization acts on continuous values but is quantization-aware as we describe below; for the final encoding and decoding, the latent and the network parameters are both quantized.

**Latent grids.** COOL-CHIC structures the latent  $\mathbf{z}$  as a hierarchy of latent grids  $(\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N)$  at multiple spatial resolutions to efficiently capture structure at different spatial frequencies. By default they are of shape  $(h, w), (\frac{h}{2}, \frac{w}{2}), \dots, (\frac{h}{2^{N-1}}, \frac{w}{2^{N-1}})$ , where  $h$  and  $w$  are the height and width of the image, respectively.

**Synthesis.** The synthesis transform  $f_\theta$  approximately reconstructs the image  $\mathbf{x}$  from these latent grids. First, each latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$  is deterministically upsampled to the resolution of the image. Then, the synthesis network  $f_\theta$  uses the resulting concatenated tensor  $\text{Up}(\mathbf{z})$  of shape  $(h, w, N)$  to predict the RGB values of the image,  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{rec}} = f_\theta(\text{Up}(\mathbf{z}))$  (see Fig. 2B). COOL-CHICv2 uses learned upsampling and a small convolutional network to parameterize  $f_\theta$ .

**Entropy coding.** For transmission, the latent grids and network parameters are quantized via rounding before being entropy-encoded into a bitstream. As this coding cost is dominated by the latent grids, an image-specific entropy model  $g_\psi$  is learned to losslessly compress them. COOL-CHIC uses an integrated Laplace distribution for entropy coding, where the location and scale parameters  $(\mu_{ij}^n, \sigma_{ij}^n)$  of the distribution for each latent grid element  $\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n$  are autoregressively predicted by the entropy network from the local neighborhood of that grid element,

$$P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^n) = \prod_{i,j} P(\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n; \mu_{ij}^n, \sigma_{ij}^n) \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_{ij}^n, \sigma_{ij}^n = g_\psi(\text{context}(\mathbf{z}^n, (i, j))). \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\text{context}(\mathbf{z}^n, (i, j))$  extracts a small causally masked neighborhood (5 – 7 latent pixels wide) around a location  $(i, j)$  from latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$  (c.f. Fig. 2A). Individual grids are modelled independently with the same network  $g_\psi$ ,  $P_\psi(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_n P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^n)$ .

The entropy and synthesis model are both small networks of depth  $\leq 4$  and width  $\leq 40$ , and their parameters are quantized after training using different bin widths. The bin width with the best RD trade-off is chosen and added to the bitstream. The quantized network parameters  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $\hat{\psi}$  are also entropy-coded using an integrated Laplace distribution that factorizes over entries with zero mean and scale determined by the empirical standard deviation:

$$P(\hat{\theta}) = \prod_i P(\hat{\theta}_i; \mu = 0; \sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{std}(\hat{\theta})) \quad (3)$$

and similarly for  $\hat{\psi}$ . Entropy coding for the latents and network parameters is performed using a range coder [64].

**Quantization-aware gradient-based optimization.** The latent ( $\mathbf{z}$ ) and parameters ( $\psi, \theta$ ) are fit to an image  $\mathbf{x}$  by jointly optimizing the following RD objective that trades off better reconstructions and more compressible latents with an RD-weight  $\lambda$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x} - f_\theta(\text{Up}(\mathbf{z}))\|_2^2 - \lambda \sum_n \log_2 P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^n). \quad (4)$$

The optimization is made quantization-aware in several ways and proceeds in two stages (cf. Tab. 1): in the (longer) first stage, uniform noise  $\mathbf{u}$  is added to the continuous latents  $\mathbf{z}$ ; in the (shorter) second stage with very low learning

rate, the latents  $\mathbf{z}$  are quantized and their gradients are approximated with the straight-through estimator, which is biased. Moreover, the rate term uses an integrated Laplace distribution.

---

Stage 1	$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}, \theta, \psi} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{u}); \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$
Stage 2	$\nabla_{\theta, \psi} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}([\mathbf{z}]) \text{ and } \tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}([\mathbf{z}])$

---

Table 1. Two-stage optimization;  $\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbf{z}}$  is straight-through estimation.

### 3. C3: Improving COOL-CHIC

We first present a series of simple and effective improvements to COOL-CHIC, which we collectively refer to as C3 (Cooler-ChiC), that lead to a significant increase in RD performance with similar decoding complexity. The overall model structure remains unchanged (cf. Fig. 2) and most of our improvements fall into one of two categories: (1) improvements to the quantization-aware optimization, and (2) improvements to the model architecture. Subsequently, we introduce the modifications necessary to apply C3 to videos. We confirm with extensive ablations in Sec. 5 and App. D that each contribution is beneficial and that their improvements are cumulative. See App. A for full details on all improvements.

#### 3.1. Optimization improvements

We maintain the same two-stage optimization structure of COOL-CHIC (see Tab. 1) but make several improvements in both stages, most notably how quantization is approximated.

**Soft-rounding (stage 1).** We apply a soft-rounding function before and after the addition of noise [2]. Let  $s_T$  be a smooth approximation of the rounding function whose smoothness is controlled by a temperature parameter  $T$ . For large  $T$ ,  $s_T$  approaches the identity while for small  $T$ ,  $s_T$  approaches the rounding function so that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} s_T(s_T(\mathbf{z}) + \mathbf{u}) = \lfloor [\mathbf{z}] + \mathbf{u} \rfloor = [\mathbf{z}]. \quad (5)$$

By varying  $T$  we can interpolate between rounding and the simple addition of uniform noise  $\mathbf{u}$ . Note that the soft-rounding does not create an information bottleneck as it is an invertible function. Therefore, adding noise is still necessary for reliable compression [2].

Small  $T$  leads to a better approximation of rounding but increases the variance of gradients for  $\mathbf{z}$ . Following previous work using soft-rounding, we therefore anneal the temperature over the course of the optimization. See Fig. 3 for a visualization and App. A.2.4 for details.

**Kumaraswamy noise (stage 1).** The addition of uniform noise as an approximation to rounding has been motivated by pointing out that for sufficiently smooth distributions,




Figure 3. Approximating the  $\text{round}(z)$  function during Stage 1 of optimization. COOL-CHIC adds uniform noise  $\mathbf{u}$ , whereas C3 uses soft-rounding  $s_T$  with varying temperatures  $T$  and Kumaraswamy noise of different strengths,  $\mathbf{u}_{\text{kum}}$ . We plot the mean and 95% interval.

the marginal distribution of the quantization error ( $\mathbf{z} - \lfloor \mathbf{z} \rfloor$ ) is approximately uniform [5]. The approximation further assumes that the quantization error and the input are uncorrelated. In practice, these assumptions may be violated, suggesting that other forms of noise are worth exploring. To that end, we replace uniform noise with samples from the Kumaraswamy distribution [41] whose support is compact on  $[0, 1]$ . This distribution is very similar to the Beta distribution but has an analytic cumulative distribution function that allows for more efficient sampling. By controlling its shape parameters we can interpolate between a peaked (lower noise) distribution at beginning of stage 1 and a uniform distribution at the end. See Fig. 3 for a visualization and App. A.2.5 for details.

**Cosine decay schedule (stage 1).** We found that a simple cosine decay schedule for the learning rate of the Adam optimizer performed well during the first stage of optimization.

**Smaller quantization step (stages 1 & 2).** COOL-CHIC quantizes the latents by rounding their values to the nearest whole integer; as a result the inputs to the synthesis and entropy networks can become large (exceeding values of 50), which can lead to instabilities or suboptimal optimization. We found that quantizing the latents in smaller steps than 1 (and correspondingly rescaling the soft-rounding in both stages) empirically improved optimization.

**Soft-rounding for gradient (stage 2).** We apply hard rounding/quantization to the latents  $\mathbf{z}$  for the forward pass of stage 2 following COOL-CHIC. For the backward pass, COOL-CHICv2 uses a straight-through gradient estimator and multiplies the gradient by a small  $\epsilon$ . This has the effect of replacing rounding by a linear function (cf. Fig. 3) and downscaling the learning rate of the latents. Instead we use soft-rounding to estimate the gradients (with a very low temperature) and start stage 2 with a low learning rate.

**Adaptive learning rate (stage 2).** We adaptively decrease the learning rate further when the RD-loss does not improve for a fixed number of steps.

### 3.2. Model improvements

We make a number of changes to the network architectures to increase their expressiveness, support the optimization, and allow for more adaptability depending on the bitrate.

**Conditional entropy model.** COOL-CHIC uses the same entropy network to independently model latent grids of starkly varying resolutions. We explored several options to increase the expressiveness of the entropy model: first, we optionally allow the context at a particular latent location to also include values from the previous grid,  $P(\mathbf{z}^n | \mathbf{z}^{n-1})$ , as this information may be helpful for prediction when different grids are correlated. Second, we optionally allow the network to be resolution-dependent by either using a separate network per latent grid or using FiLM [66] layers to make the network resolution-dependent in a more parameter-efficient way.

**ReLU → GELU.** As we are constrained to use very small networks, we replace the simple ReLU activation function with a more expressive activation; empirically we found that GELU activations [33] worked better.

**Shift log-scale of entropy model output.** Small changes in how quantities are parameterized can affect optimization considerably. For example, how the scale of the entropy distribution is computed from the raw network output strongly affects optimization dynamics, in particular at initialization; we found that shifting the predicted log-scale prior to exponentiation consistently improves performance. With improved optimization we can also use larger initialization scales than COOL-CHIC to improve performance.

**Adaptivity.** We optionally sweep over several architecture choices per image or video patch to find the best RD-tradeoff on a per-instance basis. We refer to this as *C3 adaptive*. This setting includes an option to vary the relative latent resolutions; *e.g.*, it may be beneficial not to use the highest resolution latent grid for low bitrates. Note that such adaptive settings are also common in traditional codecs [37, 76].




Figure 4. Visualization of entropy model’s context for images and video (with and without custom masking).

### 3.3. Video-specific methodology

COOL-CHIC has been successfully applied to images but not videos. Here we describe our methodology for applying C3 (and COOL-CHIC) to video, which we use on top of the improvements in Sec. 3.1 and Sec. 3.2.

**2D → 3D.** Given that videos have an extra time dimension compared to images, a natural way to extend C3 to video is to convert 2D parameters and operations to their 3D counterparts. Namely, we use 3D latent grids  $\mathbf{z}^1, \mathbf{z}^2, \dots$  of shapes  $(t, h, w), (\frac{t}{2}, \frac{h}{2}, \frac{w}{2}), \dots$ , and the entropy model’s context  $\text{context}(\mathbf{z}^n, (\tau, i, j))$  is now a 3D causal neighborhood of the latent entry  $\mathbf{z}_{\tau ij}^n$  (cf. Fig. 4 video context).

**Using video patches.** Videos have orders of magnitude more pixels than images, and a full HD video does not fit into the memory of modern GPUs. We therefore split the video into smaller video patches, and fit a separate C3 model to each patch. We find that larger patches work best for lower bitrates and smaller patches work best for higher bitrates. Our patch sizes range from (30, 180, 240) to (75, 270, 320).

**Wider context to capture fast motion.** For video patches with fast motion, the small context size that works well for images (5-7 latent pixels wide) can be smaller than the displacement of a particular keypoint in consecutive frames. This means that for a target latent pixel, the context in the previous latent frame does not contain the relevant information for the entropy model’s prediction. Hence we use a wider spatial context (up to 65 latent pixels wide) to enhance predictions for videos with faster motion.

**Custom masking.** Naïvely increasing the context width also increases the parameter count of the entropy model, which scales linearly with the context size. However, most of the context dimensions are irrelevant for prediction and can be masked out. We use a small causal mask centered at the target latent pixel for the current latent frame,

and a small rectangular mask for the previous latent frame whose position is learned during encoding time (cf. Fig. 4 video context with custom masking). See App. A.3 for details of how the position of this mask is learned.

## 4. Related work

**Neural compression by overfitting to a single instance.** COIN [20] introduced the idea of overfitting a neural network to a single image as a means for compression. This has since been improved with reduced encoding times through meta-learning [21, 70, 75] and increased RD performance via better architectures [13] or more refined quantization [18, 26]. Further improvements to RD performance have been achieved by pruning networks [46, 68, 70] and incorporating traditional compressive autoencoders [67, 71]. Recent approaches using Bayesian neural fields directly optimize RD losses, further improving performance [28, 32]. Despite this progress, no approach yet matches the RD performance of traditional codecs such as VTM.

For video, Nerv [14] overfits neural fields to single videos, using a deep convolutional network to map time indices to frames. Various follow-ups have greatly improved compression performance [4, 15, 25, 42, 47, 53], among which HiNeRV [42] shows impressive RD performance that closely matches HEVC (HM-18.0, random access setting) on standard video benchmarks. While these models are typically smaller than autoencoder-based neural codecs, the model size (and hence decoding complexity) is directly correlated with the bitrate (each point on the RD curve corresponds to a different model size), making it challenging to design a low-complexity codec at high bitrates. Further, these models are typically unsuitable for video-streaming applications, as the entire bitstream needs to be transmitted before the first frame can be decoded [80]. Note that C3 does not suffer from this limitation – the very small synthesis and entropy models can be transmitted first with little overhead, and then be used to decode the bitstream for the latents that can be synthesized into frames in a streaming fashion.

Given the generality of neural fields, codecs applicable to multiple modalities have been developed [21, 24, 70, 71]. There also exist methods specialized to other modalities: climate data [34], 3D shapes [19, 35, 55], NeRF scenes [24, 52, 77], audio [28, 44] and medical images [21, 23, 58, 72].

**Instance adaptive neural compression.** Several autoencoder-based approaches adapt the encoder to each instance through optimization but leave the decoder fixed [12, 27, 54, 87]. Such methods generally perform worse than approaches that optimize both the encoder and decoder w.r.t. an RD loss [57, 61, 80, 81]. In particular, Van Rozendaal et al. [80] introduce Insta-SSF, an instance adaptive version of the scale-space flow (SSF) model [3] (a popular autoencoder model for neural video compression).




Figure 5. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rate on Kodak.

For a fixed RD performance, the decoder of Insta-SSF is much smaller and has lower complexity than the shared decoder of SSF. Note that C3 and COOL-CHIC follow the same principle for low complexity decoding. However, there are key differences between C3/COOL-CHIC and the aforementioned instance adaptive methods: 1. we train from scratch rather than learning an initialization from a dataset; 2. we use a neural field model (without encoder) instead of an autoencoder, and show an order of magnitude lower decoding complexity; 3. for videos, there is no explicit motion compensation based on flows in our model.

**Low complexity neural codecs.** While the problem of high decoding complexity in neural compression is well established [88], most works to mitigate it are relatively recent. Early methods reduced complexity at little cost in RD performance by pruning network weights [39]. More recently, He et al. [30, 31] replace traditional autoregressive entropy models with checkerboard-based designs that allow for more efficient and parallelizable entropy coding. Further, Yang and Mandt [86] use shallow decoders to reduce decoding complexity and offset the resulting decrease in RD performance with iterative encoding. EVC [29] achieves RD performance surpassing VTM on images with decoding at 30FPS on a GPU, by carefully choosing architectures and using sparsity-based mask decay. Despite these impressive results, the decoding complexity required for these models is still an order of magnitude higher than C3.

For video, some prior works [45, 82] focus on providing efficient neural components and entropy coding that run on mobile devices. Due to these constraints, their RD performance is not yet competitive with most neural video codecs and their decoding complexity is an order of magnitude higher than C3. ELF-VC [69], based on autoencoders and flows, provides gains in efficiency by encoder/decoder asymmetry and an efficient convolutional architecture. However they do not report decoding complexity and are outperformed




Figure 6. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rate on CLIC2020.

by VCT [59] in terms of RD. AlphaVC [74] introduces a technique to skip latent dimensions for entropy coding, improving efficiency in flow-based autoencoder models and surpassing VTM (low-delay) in terms of RD performance, albeit with a high decoding complexity of 1M MACs/pixel.

## 5. Results

### 5.1. Image compression

We evaluate our model on the Kodak [40] and CLIC2020 [79] benchmarks. Kodak contains 24 images at a resolution of  $512 \times 768$ . For CLIC2020, we use the professional validation dataset split containing 41 images at various resolutions from  $439 \times 720$  to  $1370 \times 2048$ , following COOL-CHIC [43, 48]. We compare C3 against a series of baselines, including classical codecs (BPG [8], VTM [11]), autoencoder based neural codecs (BMS [6], a standard neural codec; CST [16], a strong neural codec; EVC [29], a codec optimized for RD performance and low decoding complexity; MLIC+ [38], the state of the art in terms of RD performance) and COOL-CHICv2 [48]. We measure PSNR on RGB and quantify differences in RD performance with the widely used BD-rate metric. See App. A for full experimental details and App. B for full evaluation details.

**Rate-distortion and decoding complexity.** On CLIC2020, C3 (with a single setting for its architecture and hyperparameters) significantly outperforms COOL-CHICv2 across all bitrates ( $-22.2\%$  BD-rate) and nearly matches VTM ( $+1.4\%$  BD-rate), cf. Fig. 6. When adapting the model per image, C3 even outperforms VTM ( $-2.0\%$  BD-rate). *To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time a neural codec has been able to match VTM while having very low decoding complexity (below 3k MACs/pixel).* While C3 does not yet match the RD performance of state of the art neural codecs such as MLIC+, it uses two orders of magnitude fewer operations

at decoding time, making it substantially cheaper. Results are also strong on Kodak (see Fig. 5), although, as is the case for COOL-CHIC, we perform slightly worse on this dataset relative to VTM. In Fig. 1 we compare the decoding complexity (measured in MACs/pixel) and the achieved BD-rate for C3 and other neural baselines. C3 has a similar complexity to COOL-CHIC but much better BD-rate and codecs achieving similar BD-rate to ours require at least an order of magnitude more MACs (even ones optimized for low decoding complexity such as EVC). See App. C.1 for comparisons with additional baselines (including other autoencoder based codecs and overfitted codecs) in terms of RD performance and decoding complexity.

**Decoding time.** A concern with using autoregressive models is that runtimes may be prohibitive despite low computational complexity [62]. To address this, we time the decoding process, which includes a full iterative roll-out of the autoregressive entropy model (and the upsampling and application of the synthesis network). On CPU (Intel Xeon Platinum, Skylake, 2GHz) these together take  $< 100$  ms ( $\sim 55$  ms and  $\sim 30$  ms, respectively) for an image of size  $768 \times 512$ . This does not account for the cost of range-decoding the bit-stream (which is also a component of every classical codec). We emphasize that these numbers are based on unoptimized research code and can likely be improved substantially.

**Encoding time.** C3 faces the same limitations as COOL-CHIC, in that it has very long encoding times. Here we report encoding times on an NVIDIA V100 GPU. The largest CLIC image at  $1370 \times 2048$  resolution takes 48s per 1000 iterations of optimization (*i.e.*, excluding range-encoding) with the slowest setting (largest architecture), and 22s per 1000 iterations with the fastest setting (smallest architecture). While we train for a maximum of 110k iterations, we show in App. D.3 that we can approach similar RD performance with much fewer iterations. As we run unoptimized research code, we believe the runtime can be greatly improved.

**Ablations.** In Tab. 2, we ablate our methodological contributions on Kodak by starting with our best performing model and sequentially removing each of our improvements, one after another. We show the resulting BD-rate with respect to the top row, demonstrating that our contributions stack to yield significant improvements in RD performance. In Tab. 3, we show BD-rate with respect to C3 when disabling individual features. We find that soft-rounding, Kumaraswamy noise and using GELU activations are responsible for the majority of the improvement. For the corresponding ablations on CLIC2020, please refer to App. D.1.

**Qualitative comparisons** In Fig. 7, we compare reconstructions from C3 and COOL-CHICv2 on an image from CLIC2020, showing that C3 has fewer artifacts. See App. E for a more thorough comparison.




Table 2. Kodak ablation *sequentially* removing one improvement after another. Note higher BD-rate means worse RD performance.

Removed feature	BD-rate vs. C3
Soft-rounding	22.18%
Kumaraswamy noise	3.90%
GELU	3.27%
Shifted log-scale	0.87%
Adaptive lr (stage 2)	0.68%
Quantization step < 1	0.40%

Table 3. Kodak ablation knocking out individual features from C3 (fixed hyperparameters across all images). Note higher BD-rate means worse RD performance.



Figure 7. Qualitative comparison of compression artifacts for C3 and COOL-CHICv2 at around 0.31 bpp with a PSNR of 30.28dB and 28.98dB, respectively. See App. E for the full image.

## 5.2. Video compression

We evaluate C3 on the UVG-1k dataset [60] containing 7 videos at HD resolution ( $1080 \times 1920$ ) with a total of 3900 frames. We evaluate PSNR on RGB, and compare against a series of baselines, including classical codecs (HEVC medium, no B-frames [76]), neural codecs based on overfitting (HiNeRV [42], FFNeRV [47]) and autoencoder




Figure 8. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rate on UVG.

based neural codecs (DCVC [49], VCT [59], Insta-SSF [81], MIMT [84]), among which MIMT reports state of the art RD performance on the UVG-1k dataset. Note that extensions of DCVC [50, 51, 73] also show strong RD performance but report results on a subset of UVG frames, hence we do not compare against them. See App. A for full experimental details and App. B for full evaluation details.

**Rate-distortion and decoding complexity** In Fig. 8, we show the RD performance of C3 compared to other baselines, with more baselines shown in App. C.1. In Fig. 9, we show the MACs/pixel count of each method vs the BD-rate using HEVC (medium, no B-frames) [76] as anchor. In terms of RD performance, we are on par with VCT [59], a competitive neural baseline, while requiring 4.4k MACs/pixel, which is less than 0.1% of VCT’s MACs/pixel. Among the baselines that overfit to a single video instance (NeRV and its followups) we are second best in terms of RD, widely outperforming FFNeRV [47], the previous runner up. Although C3 is behind stronger neural baselines such as HiNeRV and MIMT in terms of RD performance, our decoding complexity is orders of magnitude lower. Note that NeRV-based methods have different model sizes (and hence different MACs/pixel) for each point on the RD curve. For example, the 5 points on the RD curve for HiNeRV correspond to MACs/pixel values between 87k-1.2M [42]. In App. D.4 we show ablation studies showing the effectiveness of our video-specific methodology.

**Encoding times.** We also report encoding times for video patches on an NVIDIA V100 GPU. The slowest setting on the largest video patch of size  $75 \times 270 \times 320$  resolution takes 457s per 1000 iterations of optimization, whereas the fastest setting on the smallest video patch of size  $30 \times 180 \times 240$  takes 29s per 1000 iterations. We train for a maximum of 110k iterations but show in App. D.3 that we can approach similar RD performance with much fewer iterations.




Figure 9. BD-rate vs decoding complexity relative to HEVC (medium). For methods with varying MACs for different bitrates (e.g., C3 and HiNeRV), we report the largest MACs/pixel.

## 6. Conclusion, limitations and future work

We propose C3, the first low complexity neural codec on single images that is competitive with VTM while requiring an order of magnitude fewer MACs for decoding than state of the art neural codecs. We then extend C3 to the video setting, where we match the RD performance of VCT with less than 0.1% of their decoding complexity. Our contributions are a step towards solving one of the major open problems in neural compression — achieving high compression performance with low decoding complexity — and ultimately towards making neural codecs a practical reality.

**Limitations.** In this paper, we focused on maximizing RD performance while minimizing decoding complexity. As a result, the encoding of C3 is slow, making it impractical for use cases requiring real time encoding. Yet, there are several use cases for which paying a significant encoding cost upfront can be justified if RD performance and decoding time are improved. For example, a popular video on a streaming service is encoded once but decoded millions of times [1]. Further, the autoregressive entropy model used during decoding is inherently sequential in nature, posing challenges for efficient use of hardware designed for parallel computing. However, as shown in Sec. 5, even with unoptimized research code, an image can be decoded relatively quickly on CPU due to the very small network sizes. Moreover, further optimizations and specialized implementations such as wavefront decoding [17] can likely speed up decoding times significantly. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to explore alternative probabilistic models that can be efficiently evaluated on relevant hardware.

**Future work.** There are several promising avenues for future work. Firstly, it would be interesting to accelerate encoding via better initializations or meta-learning [21, 70, 75]. Secondly, improving decoding speed through the use

of different probabilistic models or decoding schemes is an important direction. Further, while we took an extreme view of using only a single image or video to train our models, it is likely that some level of sharing across images or videos could be beneficial. For example, sharing parts of the entropy or synthesis model may improve RD performance.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank: Wei Jiang for providing RD and MACs/pixels numbers for several baselines both on the Kodak and CLIC2020 datasets; Fabian Mentzer and Ho Man Kwan for providing video RD numbers for various baselines; Eirikur Agustsson for helping to run VTM (RA); COOL-CHIC authors for open sourcing their code; Yee Whye Teh, Nick Johnston, Fabian Mentzer and Eirikur Agustsson for helpful feedback.

## Author Contributions

ED conceived the project and wrote the initial codebase with the help of HK and MB. HK, MB, ED, LT developed and refined the project vision with the help of JRS. MB, LT, HK, ED implemented and refined the general methodology. HK designed and implemented the video-specific methodology and evaluation with help from ED and MB. MB, HK, LT worked on scaling, evaluating and improving the efficiency of experiments. MB, ED, HK, LT wrote the paper.

These authors contributed equally: HK, MB, ED.

## References

- [1] Anne Aaron, Zhi Li, Megha Manohara, Jan De Cock, and David Ronca. Per-title encode optimization. <https://netflixtechblog.com/per-title-encode-optimization-7e99442b62a2>, 2015. [Online; accessed 26-Feb-2021]. 8
- [2] Eirikur Agustsson and Lucas Theis. Universally quantized neural compression. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc. 3, 17
- [3] Eirikur Agustsson, David Minnen, Nick Johnston, Johannes Balle, Sung Jin Hwang, and George Toderici. Scale-space flow for end-to-end optimized video compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8503–8512, 2020. 5
- [4] Yunpeng Bai, Chao Dong, Cairong Wang, and Chun Yuan. Ps-nerv: Patch-wise stylized neural representations for videos. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 41–45. IEEE, 2023.
- [5] J Ballé, V Laparra, and E P Simoncelli. End-to-end optimized image compression. In *Int'l Conf on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Toulon, France, 2017. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.01704>. 1, 4
- [6] Johannes Ballé, David Minnen, Saurabh Singh, Sung Jin Hwang, and Nick Johnston. Variational image compression with a scale hyperprior. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. 1, 6, 15, 27
- [7] Jean Bégaint, Fabien Racapé, Simon Feltman, and Akshay Pushparaja. Compressai: a pytorch library and evaluation platform for end-to-end compression research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03029*, 2020. 28
- [8] Fabrice Bellard. Bpg image format. URL <https://bellard.org/bpg>, 1(2):1, 2015. 2, 6
- [9] Gisle Bjontegaard. Calculation of average psnr differences between rd-curves. *ITU SG16 Doc. VCEG-M33*, 2001. 2, 26
- [10] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. 27
- [11] Benjamin Bross, Ye-Kui Wang, Yan Ye, Shan Liu, Jianle Chen, Gary J Sullivan, and Jens-Rainer Ohm. Overview of the versatile video coding (vvc) standard and its applications. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(10):3736–3764, 2021. 2, 6, 28
- [12] Joaquim Campos, Meierhans Simon, Abdelaziz Djelouah, and Christopher Schroers. Content adaptive optimization for neural image compression. In *CVPR Workshop and Challenge on Learned Image Compression*, 2019. 5
- [13] Lorenzo Catania and Dario Allegra. Nif: A fast implicit image compression with bottleneck layers and modulated sinusoidal activations. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 9022–9031, 2023. 5
- [14] Hao Chen, Bo He, Hanyu Wang, Yixuan Ren, Ser Nam Lim, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Nerv: Neural representations for videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:21557–21568, 2021. 5, 28
- [15] Hao Chen, Matthew Gwilliam, Ser-Nam Lim, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Hnerv: A hybrid neural representation for videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10270–10279, 2023. 5, 28, 38
- [16] Zhengxue Cheng, Heming Sun, Masaru Takeuchi, and Jiro Katto. Learned image compression with discretized gaussian mixture likelihoods and attention modules. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7939–7948, 2020. 1, 6, 27
- [17] Gordon Clare, Félix Henry, and Stéphane Pateux. Wavefront parallel processing for hevc encoding and decoding. *document JCTVC-F274*, 2011. 8
- [18] Bharath Bhushan Damodaran, Muhammet Balciłar, Franck Galpin, and Pierre Hellier. Rqat-inr: Improved implicit neural image compression. In *2023 Data Compression Conference (DCC)*, pages 208–217. IEEE, 2023. 5
- [19] Thomas Davies, Derek Nowrouzezahrai, and Alec Jacobson. On the effectiveness of weight-encoded neural implicit 3d shapes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09808*, 2020. 5
- [20] Emilien Dupont, Adam Goliński, Milad Alizadeh, Yee Whye Teh, and Arnaud Doucet. Coin: Compression with implicit neural representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03123*, 2021. 1, 5, 28

- [21] Emilien Dupont, Hrushikesh Loya, Milad Alizadeh, Adam Golinski, Yee Whye Teh, and Arnaud Doucet. Coin++: Neural compression across modalities. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. 5, 8, 28
- [22] The fvcore contributors. fvcore. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/fvcore>. 27
- [23] Harry Gao, Weijie Gan, Zhixin Sun, and Ulugbek S Kamilov. Sinco: A novel structural regularizer for image compression using implicit neural representations. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023. 5
- [24] Sharath Girish, Abhinav Shrivastava, and Kamal Gupta. Shacira: Scalable hash-grid compression for implicit neural representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 17513–17524, 2023. 5
- [25] Carlos Gomes, Roberto Azevedo, and Christopher Schroers. Video compression with entropy-constrained neural representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18497–18506, 2023. 5
- [26] Cameron Gordon, Shin-Fang Chng, Lachlan MacDonald, and Simon Lucey. On quantizing implicit neural representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 341–350, 2023. 5
- [27] Tiansheng Guo, Jing Wang, Ze Cui, Yihui Feng, Yunying Ge, and Bo Bai. Variable rate image compression with content adaptive optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 122–123, 2020. 5
- [28] Zongyu Guo, Gergely Flamich, Jiajun He, Zhibo Chen, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Compression with bayesian implicit neural representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19185*, 2023. 5
- [29] Wang Guo-Hua, Jiahao Li, Bin Li, and Yan Lu. EVC: Towards real-time neural image compression with mask decay. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2, 6, 27
- [30] Dailan He, Yaoyan Zheng, Baocheng Sun, Yan Wang, and Hongwei Qin. Checkerboard context model for efficient learned image compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14771–14780, 2021. 6
- [31] Dailan He, Ziming Yang, Weikun Peng, Rui Ma, Hongwei Qin, and Yan Wang. Elic: Efficient learned image compression with unevenly grouped space-channel contextual adaptive coding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5718–5727, 2022. 1, 6, 28
- [32] Jiajun He, Gergely Flamich, Zongyu Guo, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Recombiner: Robust and enhanced compression with bayesian implicit neural representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17182*, 2023. 5, 28
- [33] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016. 4, 13
- [34] Langwen Huang and Torsten Hoefer. Compressing multidimensional weather and climate data into neural networks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 5
- [35] Berivan Isik, Philip A Chou, Sung Jin Hwang, Nick Johnston, and George Toderici. Lvac: Learned volumetric attribute compression for point clouds using coordinate based networks. *Frontiers in Signal Processing*, 2:1008812, 2022. 5
- [36] Itseez. Open source computer vision library. <https://github.com/opencv/opencv>, 2015. 19
- [37] ITU-T. Recommendation ITU-T T.81: Information technology – Digital compression and coding of continuous-tone still images – Requirements and guidelines, 1992. 4
- [38] Wei Jiang, Jiayu Yang, Yongqi Zhai, Peirong Ning, Feng Gao, and Ronggang Wang. Mlic: Multi-reference entropy model for learned image compression. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 7618–7627, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 1, 6, 27
- [39] Nick Johnston, Elad Eban, Ariel Gordon, and Johannes Ballé. Computationally efficient neural image compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.08771*, 2019. 6
- [40] Kodak. Kodak Dataset. <http://r0k.us/graphics/kodak/>, 1991. 6
- [41] P. Kumaraswamy. A generalized probability density function for double-bounded random processes. *Journal of Hydrology*, 46(1):79–88, 1980. 4, 18
- [42] Ho Man Kwan, Ge Gao, Fan Zhang, Andrew Gower, and David Bull. Hinerv: Video compression with hierarchical encoding based neural representation, 2023. 5, 7, 8, 28, 38
- [43] Théo Ladune, Pierrick Philippe, Félix Henry, Gordon Clare, and Thomas Leguay. Cool-chic: Coordinate-based low complexity hierarchical image codec. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13515–13522, 2023. 1, 2, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 27
- [44] Luca A Lanzendorfer and Roger Wattenhofer. Siamese siren: Audio compression with implicit neural representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12957*, 2023. 5
- [45] Hoang Le, Liang Zhang, Amir Said, Guillaume Sautiere, Yang Yang, Pranav Shrestha, Fei Yin, Reza Pourreza, and Auke Wiggers. Mobilecodec: neural inter-frame video compression on mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference*, pages 324–330, 2022. 1, 6
- [46] Jaeho Lee, Jihoon Tack, Namhoon Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Meta-learning sparse implicit neural representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11769–11780, 2021. 5
- [47] Joo Chan Lee, Daniel Rho, Jong Hwan Ko, and Eunbyung Park. Ffnerv: Flow-guided frame-wise neural representations for videos. 2023. 5, 7, 8
- [48] Thomas Leguay, Théo Ladune, Pierrick Philippe, Gordon Clare, and Félix Henry. Low-complexity overfitted neural image codec. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12706*, 2023. 2, 6, 13, 16, 27, 33
- [49] Jiahao Li, Bin Li, and Yan Lu. Deep contextual video compression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18114–18125, 2021. 8, 28
- [50] Jiahao Li, Bin Li, and Yan Lu. Hybrid spatial-temporal entropy modelling for neural video compression. In *Proceedings*

- of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1503–1511, 2022. 8
- [51] Jiahao Li, Bin Li, and Yan Lu. Neural video compression with diverse contexts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22616–22626, 2023. 8
- [52] Lingzhi Li, Zhen Shen, Zhongshu Wang, Li Shen, and Liefeng Bo. Compressing volumetric radiance fields to 1 mb. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4222–4231, 2023. 5
- [53] Zizhang Li, Mengmeng Wang, Huaijin Pi, Kechun Xu, Jianbiao Mei, and Yong Liu. E-nerv: Expedite neural video representation with disentangled spatial-temporal context. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 267–284. Springer, 2022. 5
- [54] Guo Lu, Chunlei Cai, Xiaoyun Zhang, Li Chen, Wanli Ouyang, Dong Xu, and Zhiyong Gao. Content adaptive and error propagation aware deep video compression. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*, pages 456–472. Springer, 2020. 5
- [55] Yuzhe Lu, Kairong Jiang, Joshua A Levine, and Matthew Berger. Compressive neural representations of volumetric scalar fields. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, pages 135–146. Wiley Online Library, 2021. 5
- [56] Bruce D Lucas and Takeo Kanade. An iterative image registration technique with an application to stereo vision. In *IJCAI’81: 7th international joint conference on Artificial intelligence*, pages 674–679, 1981. 19
- [57] Yue Lv, Jinxi Xiang, Jun Zhang, Wenming Yang, Xiao Han, and Wei Yang. Dynamic low-rank instance adaptation for universal neural image compression. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 632–642, 2023. 5
- [58] Matteo Mancini, Derek K Jones, and Marco Palombo. Lossy compression of multidimensional medical images using sinusoidal activation networks: An evaluation study. In *International Workshop on Computational Diffusion MRI*, pages 26–37. Springer, 2022. 5
- [59] Fabian Mentzer, George Toderici, David Minnen, Sergi Caelles, Sung Jin Hwang, Mario Lucic, and Eirikur Agustsson. VCT: A video compression transformer. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 1, 2, 6, 8, 26, 28
- [60] Alexandre Mercat, Marko Viitanen, and Jarno Vanne. Uvg dataset: 50/120fps 4k sequences for video codec analysis and development. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference*, pages 297–302, 2020. 2, 7
- [61] Yu Mikami, Chihiro Tsutake, Keita Takahashi, and Toshiaki Fujii. An efficient image compression method based on neural network: An overfitting approach. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 2084–2088. IEEE, 2021. 5
- [62] David Minnen and Nick Johnston. Advancing the rate-distortion-computation frontier for neural image compression. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 2940–2944. IEEE, 2023. 7
- [63] David Minnen, Johannes Ballé, and George D Toderici. Joint autoregressive and hierarchical priors for learned image compression. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018. 1, 27, 28
- [64] G. Nigel and N. Martin. Range encoding: An algorithm for removing redundancy from a digitized message. In *Video & Data Recording Conference*, 1979. 3
- [65] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. 27
- [66] Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm de Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron C. Courville. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *AAAI*, 2018. 4
- [67] Tuan Pham, Yibo Yang, and Stephan Mandt. Autoencoding implicit neural representations for image compression. In *ICML 2023 Workshop Neural Compression: From Information Theory to Applications*, 2023. 5
- [68] Juan Ramirez and Jose Gallego-Posada. L<sub>0</sub>onie: Compressing coins with l<sub>0</sub>-constraints, 2022. 5
- [69] Oren Rippel, Alexander G Anderson, Kedar Tatwawadi, Sanjay Nair, Craig Lytle, and Lubomir Bourdev. Elf-vc: Efficient learned flexible-rate video coding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 14479–14488, 2021. 6, 28
- [70] Jonathan Schwarz and Yee Whye Teh. Meta-learning sparse compression networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. 5, 8, 28
- [71] Jonathan Richard Schwarz, Jihoon Tack, Yee Whye Teh, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Modality-agnostic variational compression of implicit neural representations. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. JMLR.org, 2023. 5, 28
- [72] Armin Sheibani and Hongchuan Yu. A novel implicit neural representation for volume data. *Applied Sciences*, 13(5):3242, 2023. 5
- [73] Xihua Sheng, Jiahao Li, Bin Li, Li Li, Dong Liu, and Yan Lu. Temporal context mining for learned video compression. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2022. 8
- [74] Yibo Shi, Yunying Ge, Jing Wang, and Jue Mao. Alphavc: High-performance and efficient learned video compression. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 616–631. Springer, 2022. 6
- [75] Yannick Strümpler, Janis Postels, Ren Yang, Luc Van Gool, and Federico Tombari. Implicit neural representations for image compression. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 74–91. Springer, 2022. 5, 8, 28
- [76] Gary J Sullivan, Jens-Rainer Ohm, Woo-Jin Han, and Thomas Wiegand. Overview of the high efficiency video coding (hevc) standard. *IEEE Transactions on circuits and systems for video technology*, 22(12):1649–1668, 2012. 2, 4, 7, 8, 28
- [77] Towaki Takikawa, Alex Evans, Jonathan Tremblay, Thomas Müller, Morgan McGuire, Alec Jacobson, and Sanja Fidler.

- Variable bitrate neural fields. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2022 Conference Proceedings*, pages 1–9, 2022. 5
- [78] Lucas Theis, Wenzhe Shi, Andrew Cunningham, and Ferenc Huszár. Lossy image compression with compressive autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00395*, 2017. 1
- [79] George Toderici, Wenzhe Shi, Radu Timofte, Lucas Theis, Johannes Balle, Eirikur Agustsson, Nick Johnston, and Fabian Mentzer. Workshop and challenge on learned image compression (clic2020). In *CVPR*, 2020. 2, 6
- [80] Ties Van Rozendaal, Johann Brehmer, Yunfan Zhang, Reza Pourreza, Auke Wiggers, and Taco S Cohen. Instance-adaptive video compression: Improving neural codecs by training on the test set. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10302*, 2021. 5, 28
- [81] Ties van Rozendaal, Iris AM Huijben, and Taco Cohen. Overfitting for fun and profit: Instance-adaptive data compression. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 5, 8
- [82] Ties van Rozendaal, Tushar Singhal, Hoang Le, Guillaume Sautiere, Amir Said, Krishna Buska, Anjuman Raha, Dimitris Kalatzis, Hitarth Mehta, Frank Mayer, et al. Mobilenvc: Real-time 1080p neural video compression on a mobile device. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01258*, 2023. 1, 6
- [83] Adam Wieckowski, Jens Brandenburg, Tobias Hinz, Christian Bartnik, Valeri George, Gabriel Hege, Christian Helmrich, Anastasia Henkel, Christian Lehmann, Christian Stoffers, Ivan Zupancic, Benjamin Bross, and Detlev Marpe. Vvenc: An open and optimized vvc encoder implementation. In *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Multimedia Expo Workshops (ICMEW)*, pages 1–2. 28
- [84] Jinxi Xiang, Kuan Tian, and Jun Zhang. Mimt: Masked image modeling transformer for video compression. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 8
- [85] Yiheng Xie, Towaki Takikawa, Shunsuke Saito, Or Litany, Shiqin Yan, Numair Khan, Federico Tombari, James Tompkin, Vincent Sitzmann, and Srinath Sridhar. Neural fields in visual computing and beyond. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, pages 641–676. Wiley Online Library, 2022. 1
- [86] Yibo Yang and Stephan Mandt. Computationally-efficient neural image compression with shallow decoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 530–540, 2023. 6
- [87] Yibo Yang, Robert Bamler, and Stephan Mandt. Improving inference for neural image compression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:573–584, 2020. 5
- [88] Yibo Yang, Stephan Mandt, Lucas Theis, et al. An introduction to neural data compression. *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision*, 15(2):113–200, 2023. 1, 2, 6
- [89] Renjie Zou, Chunfeng Song, and Zhaoxiang Zhang. The devil is in the details: Window-based attention for image compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 17492–17501, 2022. 28

# C3: High-performance and low-complexity neural compression from a single image or video

## Supplementary Material

### A. Method and experimental details

#### A.1. Model architecture

Here we provide full details of all model components of C3, cf. Fig. 2 in the main paper for a visualization of the model. In App. A.4 we provide all hyperparameter settings for our experiments.

##### A.1.1 Multi-resolution latent grids

We follow COOL-CHIC and structure the latent  $\mathbf{z}$  in a hierarchy of  $N$  latent grids,  $\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N$ , at multiple resolutions. Each latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$  has a single channel and is of shape  $(h_n, w_n)$  for images and  $(t_n, h_n, w_n)$  for videos. By default, these sizes are related to the image shape  $(h, w)$  or video shape  $(t, h, w)$  through

$$(t_n, h_n, w_n) = (\frac{t}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{h}{2^{n-1}}, \frac{w}{2^{n-1}}), \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (6)$$

that is, the latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$  is a factor 2 smaller in each dimension than the previous grid  $\mathbf{z}^{n-1}$ . All latent grids are initialized to zero at the start of optimization.

##### A.1.2 Upsampling the latent grids to the resolution of the input

Each latent grid is deterministically upsampled to the input resolution  $(\{t\}, h, w)$  before all grids are concatenated together and passed as input to the synthesis network. COOL-CHIC uses simple bicubic upsampling for this [43]. COOL-CHICv2 instead uses learned upsampling that is implemented as a strided convolution (allowing for upsampling by a factor of 2 only) that is initialized to bicubic upsampling [48].

We experimented with different forms of upsampling (both learned and fixed) in our setup but found that for almost all bitrates, using simple bilinear upsampling led to the best results. More complex upsampling methods such as bicubic or Lanczos upsampling only led to better results for very low bitrates. We explain this observation as follows. For high bitrates, fine details are modeled by the highest resolution latent grid, which already matches the resolution of the input, see, *e.g.*, the top row in Fig. 26. Therefore bilinear upsampling of the lower resolution latents is sufficient. For low bitrates, only very few details are modeled by the highest resolution latent grid, see bottom row in Fig. 26. The model therefore relies much more heavily on information upsampled from the lower resolution latent grids to explain fine details; in this case, more complex upsampling methods are beneficial. Because the differences even for lowest bitrates were very small, we opted to exclusively use bilinear interpolation as it also has a lower decoding complexity. For videos we use trilinear interpolation.

##### A.1.3 Image synthesis with the synthesis network

The upsampled latents are stacked into a single tensor of shape  $(\{t\}, h, w, N)$  and are then used as input for the synthesis network  $f_\theta$ , which directly predicts the raw RGB intensity values (output values are clipped to lie in the correct range).

To parameterize  $f_\theta$ , COOL-CHIC uses a simple MLP that is applied separately to each of the  $(\{t\}, h, w)$  pixel locations. This operation can be equivalently implemented as a sequence of  $1 \times 1$  convolutions. In addition, COOL-CHICv2 optionally adds several  $3 \times 3$  residual convolutions. For the residual convolutions the input and output channel dimensionality is set to 3 to keep the decoding complexity low. C3 follows the same architecture layout but uses the more expressive GELU [33] activation function instead of ReLUs. We also opt to use narrower and deeper networks with a similar overall decoding complexity. For C3, the  $1 \times 1$  convolutions are initialized with the standard He initialization while the residual convolutions are initialized to zero.




Figure 10. Illustration of the context used by the entropy model to predict the distribution parameters of a latent grid location  $\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n$ . *Left:* Without previous grid conditioning the context only comes from a (causal) neighborhood in the same latent grid. *Right:* With previous grid conditioning a small neighborhood from the bilinearly downsampled latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^{n-1}$  is used in addition to the context from the current latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$ .

#### A.1.4 Entropy model for the latent grids

The entropy model is used to losslessly compress the (quantized) latent grids into a bitstream. Each latent grid location,  $\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n$  for images and  $\mathbf{z}_{\tau ij}^n$  for videos, respectively, is entropy en-/decoded using a quantized Laplace distribution with mean parameter  $\mu_{ij}^n$  ( $\mu_{\tau ij}^n$  for video) and scale parameter  $\sigma_{ij}^n$  ( $\sigma_{\tau ij}^n$  for video). Both parameters are autoregressively predicted from the context of the latent grid entry using the entropy network  $g_\psi$ :

$$\mu_{ij}^n, \sigma_{ij}^n = g_\psi(\text{context}(\mathbf{z}^n, (i, j))). \quad (7)$$

$$\mu_{\tau ij}^n, \sigma_{\tau ij}^n = g_\psi(\text{context}(\mathbf{z}^n, (\tau, i, j))). \quad (8)$$

Because the autoregressive prediction also occurs at decoding time, the context has to be causally masked/extracted; following COOL-CHIC, we use a (causally masked) neighborhood of the latent entry as its context (cf. Fig. 10 (*left*)).  $g_\psi$  is a fully connected network that maps the context to the Laplace distribution parameters. During optimization and encoding, when all latent entries are available, we use  $1 \times 1$  convolutions ( $1 \times 1 \times 1$  for video) with the corresponding number of channels to replace the MLP and use a masked  $k_h \times k_w$  convolution ( $k_t \times k_h \times k_w$  for video) to replace the extraction of context of size  $k$  and the first layer of the MLP, cf. Fig. 10 (*left*).

The scale parameter  $\sigma$  of the Laplace distribution is constrained to be positive while the output of the entropy network  $g_\psi$  in unconstrained and can be positive and negative. We therefore pass the raw prediction of the network through an exponential function; in other words, the network predicts the log-scale instead of the scale as is usually done in practice when parameterizing positive values. We found that shifting the predicted raw log-scale value by a constant can improve optimization dynamics as it determines the behavior of the model close to initialization.

So far the context for an entry  $\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n$  only takes into account the local neighborhood in the same grid  $\mathbf{z}^n$ . This means that the entropy model factorizes across grids:

$$P_\psi(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_n P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^n). \quad (9)$$

Alternatively, we also consider the option of extending this context to include local grid entries in a neighboring grid  $\mathbf{z}^{n-1}$ :

$$P_\psi(\mathbf{z}) = P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^1) \prod_{n>1} P_\psi(\mathbf{z}^n | \mathbf{z}^{n-1}). \quad (10)$$

Note that because of the autoregressive structure, we can only depend on the neighboring grid in one direction. In that case, we downsample the previous latent grid  $\mathbf{z}^{n-1}$  to the same resolution as the current grid,  $\mathbf{z}^n$ , and extract the full neighborhood around the location of interest from it; cf. Fig. 10 (*right*) for an illustration. The size of the neighborhood extracted from the previous grid can vary from the size of the neighborhood in the current grid. We found that in practice, small neighborhood sizes for the previous grid (*e.g.*  $3 \times 3$ ) were sufficient.

We also explored the option of using separate entropy parameters for different grids

$$P_\psi(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_n P_{\psi^n}(\mathbf{z}^n), \quad (11)$$

and found that while this did not help for images, it gave better RD performance on videos, especially when using different masking patterns for different grids (cf. App. A.3).

## A.2. Quantization-aware optimization of the rate-distortion objective

Here, we provide further details about the RD objective in Eq. (4) that is used to fit the latent grids  $\mathbf{z}$  as well as the synthesis network  $f_\theta$  and the entropy network  $g_\psi$  to a particular image  $\mathbf{x}$  using gradient-based optimization. We reproduce the objective here for easier reference:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x} - f_\theta(\text{Upsample}(\mathbf{z}))\|_2^2 - \lambda \log_2 P_\psi(\mathbf{z}). \quad (4)$$

The objective trades off reconstruction of the image (first term) and compression of the latent  $\mathbf{z}$  (second term) with an RD-weight  $\lambda$ . By varying  $\lambda$  we trace out different points in the RD-plane that we plot as RD-curves. High values of  $\lambda$  lead to low bitrates and vice versa. Note that the objective does not take into account the quantization of the model parameters  $\theta$  and  $\psi$ .

At evaluation time, the distortion (measured in PSNR) and the rate are computed from quantized versions of the variables,  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ ,  $\hat{\theta}$ , and  $\hat{\psi}$ , that have been entropy-decoded from the bitstream, see Fig. 2 for an illustration of the decoding.

During optimization we evaluate the RD-loss in Eq. (4) using continuous variables  $\mathbf{z}, \theta, \psi$ . Naive minimization of the objective w.r.t. the continuous variables would give rise to a solution that does not work well when the variables are quantized. Instead, we have to take the subsequent quantization into account during optimization. In practice, quantization of the latent grid values  $\mathbf{z}$  is most relevant, such that the optimization is only made aware of the quantization of the latent grids and not of the quantization of the network parameters themselves. We explain how these network parameters are quantized and entropy en-/decoded in App. A.2.6.

### A.2.1 Quantized Laplace distribution for continuous variables: Integrated Laplace distribution

As explained above, the rate is modeled by (the log density of) a quantized Laplace distribution  $P_\psi$  whose distribution parameters are predicted by the entropy model  $g_\psi$ .

During optimization we use continuous values and, following Ballé et al. [6] and Ladune et al. [43], replace the quantized Laplace distribution with an integrated Laplace distribution that integrates the probability mass over the rounding/quantization interval. When evaluated on quantized values, the two distributions are identical:

$$P_\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n) = \int_{\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n - 0.5}^{\mathbf{z}_{ij}^n + 0.5} \text{Laplace}(z; \mu_{ij}^n, \sigma_{ij}^n) dz, \quad (12)$$

where the location parameter  $\mu_{ij}^n$  and the scale parameter  $\sigma_{ij}^n$  of the Laplace distribution are autoregressively predicted by the entropy network  $g_\psi$ .

### A.2.2 Two stages of optimization

Following COOL-CHIC and COOL-CHICv2, we split the optimization into two stages that differ in how the quantization of the latents is approximated. As discussed in the main paper, we make improvements to both stages. Here, we explain the two stages used by C3 in details; we also highlight the main differences to prior work where appropriate.

**Stage 1: Soft-rounding  $\mathbf{z}$  and adding noise to it.** In the first stage, the continuous values for the latent grids  $\mathbf{z}$  are passed through an invertible soft-rounding function and additionally perturbed with additive noise as we describe in Apps. A.2.4 and A.2.5, respectively. Because the soft-rounding function is invertible and differentiable everywhere, we can compute its gradient with backpropagation, and the additive noise can be ignored for the gradient computation as it does not

depend on any of the parameters (the soft-rounding function is implemented in a reparameterized form):

$$\text{forward : } \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\text{softround}_T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim p_{\text{noise}}(\mathbf{u}) \quad (13)$$

$$\text{backward for } \theta, \psi : \quad \nabla_{\theta, \psi} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\text{softround}_T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})) \quad (14)$$

$$\text{backward for } \mathbf{z} : \quad \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\text{softround}_T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})) \quad (15)$$

Gradient variance is a concern in this stage of training, especially since we use larger learning rates. Because of this, we cannot use a temperature  $T$  in the soft-rounding that is too low (cf. App. A.2.4 for details), and we also found it beneficial to use more concentrated noise distributions than uniform noise early in training (cf. App. A.2.5 for details).

COOL-CHIC and COOL-CHICv2 do not use soft-rounding and instead directly add uniform noise,  $p_{\text{noise}}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{Uniform}(\mathbf{u})$ .

**Stage 2: Hard-rounding  $\mathbf{z}$ .** In the second stage, the continuous values for the latent grids  $\mathbf{z}$  are (hard-)rounded; *i.e.*, they are replaced by their quantized values  $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \lfloor \mathbf{z} \rfloor$ . Quantizing the latents increases the variance of the gradients w.r.t. the network parameters  $\theta$  and  $\psi$  and necessitates lower learning rates as we discuss in App. A.2.3. To estimate gradients w.r.t. the latent  $\mathbf{z}$ , we have to backpropagate through the discrete rounding; as this is not possible, we replace the hard-rounding with soft-rounding using a very low temperature  $T = 10^{-4}$  for this case. This estimator approximates the hard-rounding well but is invertible; however, it is still biased. Note that we do not add any noise when using this soft-rounding estimator.

$$\text{forward : } \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\lfloor \mathbf{z} \rfloor) \quad (16)$$

$$\text{backward for } \theta, \psi : \quad \nabla_{\theta, \psi} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\lfloor \mathbf{z} \rfloor) \quad (17)$$

$$\text{backward for } \mathbf{z} : \quad \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi}(\text{softround}_{T \rightarrow 0}(\mathbf{z})) \quad (18)$$

Because of our improvements to stage 1, the loss as well as the corresponding rate and distortion values do not change by much in the second stage of optimization. Overall, stage 2 seems to be less important for C3 than for COOL-CHICv2, though it still leads to small improvements. See App. D.2 for an ablation.

COOL-CHIC also uses the quantized latent  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  in the second stage but uses simple (linear) straight-through estimation to estimate gradients w.r.t.  $\mathbf{z}$  [43]; the linear function is a cruder approximation of (hard) rounding than the soft-rounding function, such that the bias of this estimator is larger than for C3. COOL-CHICv2 also uses linear straight-through estimation but downscals the gradient by a factor  $\epsilon \ll 1$  [48]. This results in the same biased straight-through estimator but effectively changes the learning rate of the latents to be smaller.

### A.2.3 Learning rate decay




Figure 11. Schematic of the learning rates used for the two stages of optimization. Axes are not to scale and values are only indicative. In stage 1, the learning rate is decayed with a cosine schedule from an initial value to 0 at the end of stage 1. In stage 2 we adaptively decay the learning rate by a constant factor whenever the evaluation loss does not improve for a certain number of steps.

As for most optimization based algorithms the learning rate is one of the most important hyperparameters in C3. We use two simple strategies to choose the learning rate for stage 1 and stage 2, respectively, cf. Fig. 11 for a schematic.

**Learning rate in Stage 1.** We use a cosine decay schedule that starts at a higher value and is decayed to 0 throughout stage 1, which also makes up most of the optimization steps. The initial learning rate value is chosen empirically.

**Learning rate in Stage 2.** Due to the variance of the gradients and the bias of the estimator, the second stage of optimization depends even more strongly on the learning rate. We found that starting with a high enough learning rate was important to make progress, but that an aggressive decay of the learning rate may be necessary as otherwise the loss can quickly get worse. Instead of using a fixed schedule, we therefore opted for the following automatic and adaptive mechanism: Starting from a fixed sufficiently high learning rate ( $10^{-4}$  in our experiments), we track the loss and decay the learning rate by a fixed factor if the loss does not improve for a certain number of steps. Upon decaying the learning rate we also reset the parameters  $(\mathbf{z}, \theta, \psi)$  and optimizer state to their previous best values as measured by the loss. The stage finishes after a certain number of steps or when the learning rate is decayed below a certain threshold value.

#### A.2.4 Soft-rounding

As discussed above, we warp the continuous latent values  $\mathbf{z}$  during the first stage of optimization with a soft-rounding function to better approximate the eventual quantization of the latents. A soft-rounding function is a differentiable relaxation of the (hard) rounding function; that is, it has a parameter  $T$  (typically referred to as *temperature*) whose value determines how well we approximate the hard rounding function. Crucially, by setting  $T$  to a particular value ( $T = 0$  in our case), we recover the hard rounding function. As  $T \rightarrow \infty$  our soft-rounding function (see below) tends to a linear function, equivalent to the straight-through gradient estimator that is used in COOL-CHIC [43]. Note that despite using a soft-rounding function, we still have to add random noise to regularize the optimization. We explain this further in App. A.2.5.

Following Agustsson and Theis [2], we use a construction where we apply soft-rounding twice: first to the raw value  $\mathbf{z}$  and a second time after adding random noise  $\mathbf{u}$  to the result. That is, the  $\text{softround}_T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})$  function in Eqs. (13) to (15) is given by

$$\text{softround}_T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}) = r_T(s_T(\mathbf{z}) + \mathbf{u}), \quad (19)$$

where  $r_T$  and  $s_T$  are simple soft-rounding functions.

Following Agustsson and Theis [2], we used the following simple soft-rounding function,

$$s_T(z) = \lfloor z \rfloor + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\tanh(\Delta/T)}{\tanh(1/2T)} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \Delta = z - \lfloor z \rfloor - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (20)$$

which is invertible and differentiable everywhere. We further also use

$$r_T(y) = s_T^{-1}(y - 0.5) + 0.5 \approx \mathbb{E}_X[X \mid s_T(X) + U = y] \quad (21)$$

for the second soft-rounding function (instead of applying  $s_T$  again) as suggested by Agustsson and Theis [2]. Here,  $X$  and  $U$  are assumed to be uniform random variables. We found that  $s_T(s_T(z) + u)$  seemed to perform equally well in our setting.

As the learning rate is decayed throughout stage 1, we can also decrease the temperature  $T$  of the soft-rounding to better approximate the rounding operation. For simplicity we use a linear schedule that interpolates between a higher temperature ( $T = 0.3$ ) at the beginning of stage 1 and a lower temperature ( $T = 0.1$ ) at the end of stage 1. A higher temperature corresponds to a more linear function while a lower temperature leads to a more step-like function, cf. Fig. 3.

#### A.2.5 Kumaraswamy noise distribution

As discussed in Sec. 3.1, adding noise during stage 1 is necessary even with soft-rounding because the (invertible) soft-rounding function alone does not create an information bottleneck. What do we mean by this? Hard rounding irreversibly destroys information by mapping all latent values in a certain quantization bin to the same (quantized) value. Downstream computations, such as the reconstruction of the image with the synthesis network, then only have access to these quantized values. Therefore, it is important that the synthesis and entropy network are optimized in such a way as to only rely on the information in the quantized values, rather than information about the precise location of the latent within the quantization bin. During optimization we use continuous valued latents as well as a continuous and invertible relaxation of rounding (as discussed in App. A.2.4). And while the soft-rounding function can be steep for low temperatures  $T$ , its warping can be undone; that is, the synthesis network could learn to invert the soft-rounding function and then rely on information about location within the bin to improve the distortion loss without sacrificing the rate loss. The addition of noise is a mechanism to destroy this information




Figure 12. Probability density function (PDF) of the simplified Kumaraswamy distribution, cf. Eq. (23), and the effect of using it in the soft-rounding function (Eq. (19)) for two values of the shape parameter  $a$ . *left:*  $a = 1$  corresponds to the uniform distribution; *right:*  $a = 2$  yields a more peaked distribution that results in reduced variability of the soft-rounding function. For the soft-rounding we plot the mean and its 95-percentiles.

in a *differentiable* manner, such that we can still evaluate gradients of the objective, but prevent the networks from learning to use this information (that will get destroyed with quantization).

A consequence of adding noise is that the gradients of the objective (Eqs. (14) and (15)) become stochastic, and the strength of the noise determines the variance of these gradients. Large gradient variance can lead to slower or worse optimization. In particular when using the soft-rounding function, there is no reason *a priori* that uniform noise should strike the best balance. We therefore explored other noise distributions as the detail in the following.

We want to flexibly parameterize the noise distribution in the compact interval  $[0, 1]$ . A natural choice for this is the Beta( $a, b$ )-distribution that has two shape parameters  $a$  and  $b$  and can represent the Uniform distribution as well as symmetric and asymmetric overdispersed (spread out) and underdispersed (peaked) distributions. However, we found that sampling from the Beta-distribution is slow due to the transcendental functions involved in computing its density and CDF. We therefore use the Kumaraswamy distribution [41] that is similar to the Beta-distribution but has a closed form density and CDF.

The Kumaraswamy probability density function also has two shape parameters,  $a$  and  $b$ , and is given by

$$p_{a,b}(u) = abu^{a-1}(1-u^a)^{b-1}. \quad (22)$$

We are only interested in distributions with a mode at 0.5 so as not to favor one direction; we can therefore simplify the distribution to only have a single parameter  $a$ :

$$p_{\text{kum}=a}(u) = (2^a(a-1)+1)u^{a-1}(1-u^a)^{\frac{1}{a}(2^a-1)(a-1)}. \quad (23)$$

Setting  $a = 1$  corresponds to the uniform distribution,  $p_{\text{kum}=1}(u) = \text{Uniform}(u)$ . We plot this simplified Kumaraswamy distribution (Eq. (23)) for  $a = 1$  and  $a = 2$  in Fig. 12. Note that while the mode is at  $u = 0.5$ , the distribution is not quite symmetric; yet we observed that this did not matter in practice, likely because the asymmetry is small.

In Fig. 12 we also show the effect of sampling from these distributions on the soft-rounding; as expected, sampling from a more peaked distribution,  $p_{\text{kum}=2}$ , leads to smaller uncertainty intervals at the same temperature ( $T = 0.3$  in this case) for the soft-rounding.

Because gradient variance is of more concern at high learning rates at the beginning of stage 1, the trade-off between regularization and optimization dynamics changes throughout stage 1. Empirically we found that linearly decaying the shape parameter  $a$  from  $a = 2$  at the beginning of stage 1 to  $a = 1$  (uniform distribution) at the end of stage 1 performed best.

#### A.2.6 Quantization and entropy encoding/decoding of the network parameters

Following COOL-CHIC, we treat the synthesis and entropy parameters  $\theta, \psi$  as continuous values during training, and quantize them separately after training. We do a grid search over the quantization steps for the weights and bias terms for  $\theta$  and  $\psi$  (so two terms in total, one for weight terms in either  $\theta$  or  $\psi$  and one for bias terms in either  $\theta$  or  $\psi$ ), that give quantized parameters

$\hat{\theta}$  and  $\hat{\psi}$ . We select the quantization step that minimizes the following modified objective:

$$\mathcal{L}'_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\psi}}(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x} - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\text{Upsample}(\mathbf{z}))\|_2^2 - \lambda(\log_2 P_{\hat{\psi}}(\mathbf{z}) + \log P(\hat{\theta}) + \log P(\hat{\psi})) \quad (24)$$

Note that the RD-objective and the optimization thereof are not quantization-aware with respect to these network parameters. Addressing this may constitute interesting future work.

### A.3. Video: learning the custom masking




Figure 13. (Top) First few frames of a video patch from the Jockey sequence (UVG). (Bottom) displacement of key-points between consecutive frames computed using the OpenCV [36] implementation of Lucas-Kanade optical flow estimation [56].

In the video setting, the context for predicting latent entries for a particular frame can also contain entries from the previous frame (cf. Fig. 4). As discussed in Sec. 3.3, it is important that the context is wide enough for the context of the previous frame to contain relevant information for predicting the latent entry of a particular frame. For example, consider the first few frames of the video patch shown in the first row Fig. 13. The second row shows the displacement of key-points between consecutive frames, and we can see that the displacement is greater than the small context width ( $5 - 7$  latent pixels) that we use for images. In fact, the displacement of key-points between consecutive frames in the second row can be quantified using the Lucas-Kanade method for optical flow estimation [56]. This gives a mean displacement of  $(19.5, 0.6)$  pixels per frame in the  $x$  and  $y$  direction respectively, where the mean is taken across the first 30 frames. Given that the latents and the synthesis network are designed in such a way that the latents only contain very local information about the video pixels, we would not be able to use the previous latent frame for predicting the current latent frame with a small context width. Hence we use a larger context width to be able to better capture motion.

The issue with naïvely using a larger context is that the number of entropy parameters grows with the context size, as we need  $c_{\text{hidden}}$  entropy parameters for every context entry. Given that most of the latent entries in this wide context are irrelevant for predicting the target latent entry, we learn a custom mask for the previous latent frame context such that the entropy model can still access the relevant context in the previous latent frame while ignoring the irrelevant context therein.

Here we describe the procedure for learning this custom mask, with an overview in Fig. 14:

1. **Train C3 with wide spatial context for a few iterations.** First, train the entropy model with causal masking using a wide spatial context of size  $C \times C$  per latent grid for  $M$  iterations, where  $M$  is small. Typically we use  $C = 65$ . Note that the wide context applies to both the previous latent frame  $\tau - 1$  and the current latent frame  $\tau$ . We train with separate entropy parameters for each latent grid.
2. **Compute magnitudes of entropy model weights for each context dimension.** For each latent grid, take the  $C^2$  dimensions of the previous latent frame  $\tau - 1$ , and for each dimension compute the mean magnitude of the entropy model's first layer weights that process this dimension. *i.e.*, suppose the entropy model's first  $1 \times 1$  Conv layer for the previous latent frame context has weights of shape  $C \times C \times 1 \times f_{\text{out}}$ . Take the absolute value of these weights, followed by the mean across the final two axes to obtain the  $C \times C$  magnitudes for each of the  $C^2$  context dimensions.




Figure 14. Visualization of the 3-step procedure for learning the custom masking.

3. **Choose rectangular mask location that maximizes the sum of magnitudes within mask.** Given a fixed rectangular mask shape  $c \times c'$  (where  $c, c' \ll C$ ), sweep over all possible locations of the rectangular mask within the  $C \times C$  context grid. For each location, compute the sum of the  $c \times c'$  magnitudes within the mask. Then choose the location that has the highest sum.

We thus obtain the  $c \times c'$  learned rectangular mask for the previous latent frame  $\tau - 1$ . We also empirically observed that for the lower resolution latent grids, there is little correlation between the latents for different frames, hence the entropy model doesn't use the previous latent frame for the prediction of the target latent pixel (orange border in Fig. 14). Hence we only use a learned mask for the  $K$  highest resolution latent grids, and for the remaining grids we mask out all of the previous latent frame so that it is unused by the entropy model.

Also note that for the current latent frame  $\tau$ , the relevant contexts for predicting the target latent pixel should only be a handful of values in the neighborhood of the target among the  $(C^2 - 1)/2$  causal context dimensions. So it would be a waste of entropy parameters (that need to be compressed and transmitted) to process the irrelevant context dimensions. Hence we use a small causal neighbourhood of size  $l$  (where  $l \leq C$  and  $l$  is odd) around the target latent pixel, the same as for images Fig. 10 (left). Note that this causal neighbourhood for the current latent frame is fixed rather than learned, and used for all latent grids rather than just the  $K$  highest resolution grids. Given this custom masking for the previous and latent frames, we train C3 from scratch, fixing the custom mask.




Figure 15. Visualization of the custom masks learned with the procedure described in App. A.3. The heatmap represents the magnitude of the weights in step 2 of App. A.3, and the blue box represents the learned custom masking for the previous latent frame for each latent grid.

In practice we use  $C = 65, M = 1000, c = c' = 4, K = 3, l = 7$ ; these values were obtained from a hyperparameter sweep on a small subset of patches of the UVG dataset.

In Fig. 15, we show that we are able to learn a sensible custom mask with the above procedure when applied to a video patch of the Jockey sequence in Fig. 13. We use a low value of RD-weight  $\lambda$  (Eq. (4)) for training, *i.e.*, train for a high bitrate.

The heatmaps in Fig. 15 correspond to step 2 of the procedure above (*compute magnitudes of entropy model weights for each context dimension*) when training on this video patch. After  $M = 1000$  iterations, we see that the entropy model for the first latent grid  $z^1$  (top row) assigns the highest weights to the context dimensions that are consistent with the displacement calculated above, relative to the central target pixel. In step 3, the blue learned mask is placed here as this position has the greatest sum of magnitudes within the mask. For the second latent grid  $z^2$  (bottom row), we see that the region corresponding to the displacement calculated above does indeed have higher weights than its neighborhood, but the highest weight is given to the central pixel. This indicates that the correlation between the latent dimensions that correspond to the same key-point in consecutive frames is weaker for  $z^2$  compared to  $z^1$ . Given that we have trained for a high bitrate, most of the information content lies in  $z^1$ . This is consistent with the above observation that the aforementioned correlation is stronger for  $z^1$  compared to  $z^2$ .

#### A.4. Hyperparameters

Here, we give an overview and a brief description of the hyperparameters used in our experiments as well as their settings. These comprise both architecture choices (and their hyperparameters) as well as optimization hyperparameters. As explained in the main paper, for images we distinguish between evaluations with a single fixed setting for all images (that we simply denote as C3) and an adaptive setting where we select the best hyperparameter choice out of a small set on a per-image basis (we denote this as C3 *adaptive*). For videos we always select the best hyperparameters out of a small set on a per-patch basis. The choices of varying hyperparameters form part of the header that is transmitted with the bitstream, as they are needed to decode the image.

In Tab. 4 we provide a comprehensive list of all hyperparameters of C3. We also give their default values if they are fixed for all experiments and specify whether they are included in the *adaptive* setting.

In Tabs. 5 and 6 we separately list all hyperparameters that differ for images and videos, respectively. We provide both fixed values as well as the possible sets of values that are explored in the *adaptive* setting.

**Adaptive setting for Kodak.** For Kodak, the *adaptive* setting independently explores different values for three hyperparameters (see Tab. 5):

- Whether the highest resolution latent grid is included (2 choices);
- Different entropy and synthesis network sizes (3 choices);
- Different context sizes for the entropy model (2 choices)

In total the *adaptive* setting explores  $2 \times 2 \times 3 = 12$  hyperparameter settings and picks the best one per image.

**Adaptive setting for CLIC2020.** For CLIC2020, the *adaptive* setting independently explores different values for two hyperparameters (see Tab. 5):

- Whether the highest resolution latent grid is included (2 choices);
- Different entropy and synthesis network sizes (3 choices)

In total the *adaptive* setting explores  $2 \times 3 = 6$  hyperparameter settings and picks the best one per image.

**Adaptive setting for UVG.** For UVG, we only use the *adaptive* setting, which explores different values for six hyperparameters that are grouped together as follows (see Tab. 6). See App. D.4 for results using single/fewer settings. Namely we explore three "entropy parameter settings", (E 1), (E 2), (E 3), that jointly specify the following hyper parameters:

- Whether a separate entropy model is learned per grid;
- Different context sizes for the entropy model;
- Whether custom masking is used

Similarly, we explore three "synthesis parameter settings", (S 1), (S 2), (S 3), that jointly specify the following hyperparameters:

- Whether the bias of the last layer of the synthesis network is initialized to the mean RGB values of the image;
- Whether the  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  3D convolutions in the synthesis model are replaced by  $3 \times 3$  2D convolutions per frame.

In total the adaptive setting explores  $3 \times 3 = 9$  hyperparameter settings and picks the best one per video patch.

Moreover, the video patch size is chosen according to the RD-weight  $\lambda$ , as we observed that larger patches give better RD performance for high values of  $\lambda$  (low bitrates) and vice versa. We use  $(30 \times 180 \times 240)$  for  $\lambda \leq 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ,  $(60 \times 180 \times 240)$  for  $2 \cdot 10^{-4} < \lambda \leq 10^{-3}$ ,  $(75 \times 270 \times 320)$  for  $\lambda > 10^{-3}$ .

Hyperparameter	Fixed value	In adaptive setting?
Quantization – Stage 1		
Number of encoding iterations	$10^5$	
Initial learning rate	$10^{-2}$	
Final learning rate	0	
Initial value of T for soft rounding	0.3	
Final value of T for soft rounding	0.1	
Initial value of $a$ for Kumaraswamy noise	2.0 (camera) / 1.75 (video)	
Final value of $a$ for Kumaraswamy noise	1.0	
Threshold for gradient L2 norm clipping	10 (camera) / 0.03 (video)	
Quantization – Stage 2		
Maximum number of encoding iterations	$10^4$	
Initial learning rate	$10^{-4}$	
Decay lr if loss has not improved for this many steps	20	
Decay lr by multiplying with this factor	0.8	
Finish Stage 2 early if lr drops below this value	$10^{-8}$	
Value of $T$ for soft-rounding gradient estimation	$10^{-4}$	
Architecture – Latents		
Number of latent grids	—	
Quantization step (bin width) for rounding	—	
Use the highest resolution grid ( $\{t\}, h, w$ )?	—	camera
Architecture – Synthesis model		
Output channels of the $1 \times 1$ convolutions (list)	—	camera and video
Number of $3 \times 3$ residual convolutions (with 3 channels)	2	
Initialize the last layer bias with mean RGB of the image?	—	video
(video only) Replace $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Conv with $3 \times 3$ Convs per frame	—	video
Architecture – Entropy model		
Widths of the $1 \times 1$ convolutions	—	camera and video
Log-scale of Laplace is shifted by ... before exp	8	
Scale parameter of Laplace is clipped to	$[10^{-3}, 150]$	
Context size (same grid)	—	camera and video
Include previous grid in context?	—	camera
Context size (previous grid)	$3 \times 3$	
Architecture – Entropy model (video only)		
Learn separate models per grid, $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N)$ ?	—	video
Use custom masking (cf. App. A.3)?	—	video
Mask size (current frame), $l$	$7 \times 7$	
Mask size (previous frame), $c \times c'$	$4 \times 4$	
Iteration count to learn the mask, $M$	1000	
Number of grids for which mask is learned, $K$	3	
Other		
Possible quantization steps for network parameters	clubs	
(video only) Size of video patches	—	video

Table 4. Hyperparameters and their values for the quantization-aware optimization and architecture of C3 for images (camera) and video (video). Where hyperparameters are fixed for all experiments and evaluations, their values are listed. Otherwise they are specified in the image or video specific hyperparameter list in Tabs. 5 and 6, respectively. An icon in the last column indicates whether a hyperparameter is included in the *adaptive* setting for images and/or videos. Except for gradient L2 norm clipping, all quantization hyperparameter values are the same for images and videos. clubs The possible quantization steps for the network parameter  $\theta$  and  $\psi$  are  $\{5 \cdot 10^{-5}, 10^{-4}, 5 \cdot 10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 3 \cdot 10^{-3}, 6 \cdot 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}\}$  for the weights and biases separately.

<b>Hyperparameter</b>	<b>Fixed value</b>	<b>Adaptive values</b>
Number of latent grids	7	—
Latent quantization step (bin width) for rounding	0.4	—
Use the highest resolution grid ( $h, w$ )?	✓	✓, ✗
Output channels of synthesis $1 \times 1$ convs*	(18, 18)	(12, 12), (18, 18), (24, 24)
Initialize the last synthesis layer bias with mean RGB of the image?	✗	—
Output channels of entropy $1 \times 1$ convs*	(18, 18)	(12, 12), (18, 18), (24, 24)
Learn separate entropy model per grid, $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N)$ ?	✗	—
Kodak only		
Include previous grid in context?	✗	—
Context size (same grid) in entropy model	$7 \times 7$	$5 \times 5, 7 \times 7$
CLIC2020 only		
Include previous grid in context?	✓	—
Context size (same grid) in entropy model	$7 \times 7$	—

Table 5. Hyperparameter values that are specific to images. *Fixed value* contains the values that are fixed for all images. It also contains the default values in the (non-adaptive) setting. *Adaptive values* specifies the values that are explored in the adaptive setting.

\* The adaptive values for the synthesis and entropy model sizes are varied together.

Hyperparameter	Fixed value	Adaptive values					
		(E1)	(E2)	(E3)	(S1)	(S2)	(S3)
Size of video patches	—			(30 × 180 × 240), (60 × 180 × 240), (75 × 270 × 320)♦			
Number of latent grids	—	6	5	6			
Latent quantization step (bin width) for rounding	0.3						
Use the highest resolution grid ( $t, h, w$ )?	✓						
Learn separate entropy model per grid, $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N)$ ?	—	✗	✓	✓			
Output channels of entropy $1 \times 1$ convs	—	(16, 16)	(2, 2)	(8, 8)			
Context size (same grid) in entropy model	—	3 × 9 × 9	3 × 9 × 9	3 × 65 × 65			
Use custom masking?	—	✗	✗	✓			
Include previous grid in context?	✗						
Output channels of synthesis $1 \times 1$ convs	(32, 32)						
Initialize the last synthesis bias with mean RGB of the image?	—				✓	✓	✗
Replace $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Conv with $3 \times 3$ Convs per frame	—				✓	✗	✓

Table 6. Hyperparameter settings that are specific to videos. *Fixed value* contains the hyperparameter values that are fixed for all images. *Adaptive values* lists the hyperparameter values that are explored for each patch separately. There are three possible settings for the entropy model, (E1), (E2), (E3), and three possible settings for the synthesis model, (S1), (S2), (S3). Therefore, for each patch, we explore  $3 \times 3 = 9$  different settings.

♦ The video patch size is chosen according to the RD-weight  $\lambda$ . We use  $(30 \times 180 \times 240)$  for  $\lambda \leq 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ,  $(60 \times 180 \times 240)$  for  $2 \cdot 10^{-4} < \lambda \leq 10^{-3}$ ,  $(75 \times 270 \times 320)$  for  $\lambda > 10^{-3}$ .

## B. Evaluation details

### B.1. BD-rate

The Bjøntegaard Delta rate (BD-rate) metric [9] is a scalar that estimates the saving in bitrate of one RD curve compared to another. It is useful since it allows to quantify the improvement of one RD curve over another with a single scalar. Given an anchor RD curve and a candidate RD curve, the curves are first transformed into a curve of distortion vs log-rate. Then the difference between the area under the curve (with respect to the distortion/PSNR axis) of the candidate and the anchor are computed. Note that since the area under the curve is measured with respect to the distortion axis, the smaller the area under the curve, the better. Therefore a negative value of the BD-rate implies that the candidate curve is better than the anchor. Also note that the output is invariant to (positive) scalar multiplication of the rate, due to the use of the log rate. Hence the BD rate should be invariant to whether we use bpp, bits or nats.

### B.2. PSNR evaluation for videos

We compute PSNR with the following convention also used in Mentzer et al. [59]: take the per-frame PSNR for each frame of a given video, then take the mean across all frames for that video to get a PSNR value for that video. Take the mean of these values across all videos to get the PSNR for a given RD-weight. For bpp, simply take the mean across all patches of a video to get the bpp for a given video, then take the mean across all videos.

### B.3. Entropy coding




Figure 16. The true bit-rate observed when range coding images into a bit-stream is nearly identical to our estimates of the bit-rate obtained by evaluating log-probabilities. Each point corresponds to an image encoded at a given rate-distortion weight.

To encode images to files, we use the `range-coder` Python package available in PyPI. First, hyperparameter choices and other information that depend on the image are uniformly encoded. These currently include the image resolution and the choice of quantization step widths for the synthesis transform and the entropy model. Other hyperparameters (such as the model architecture) are assumed to be fixed and known to the decoder. Next, the weights and biases of the synthesis transform and entropy model are encoded assuming a different zero-mean Laplace distribution for each layer's set of weights and set of biases. The scale of the Laplace distribution is estimated from the parameters themselves, quantized to one of 1024 possible values, and uniformly entropy encoded using the range coder. Finally, the latent grids are autoregressively encoded with a Laplace distribution whose mean and scale are predicted by the entropy model.

For convenience and faster turnaround times, bpp values used in plots throughout the paper were estimated by evaluating the log-probabilities that would be used when range coding model parameters and latent values. We find that these estimates are very close to the bit-rates observed when range coding using the default, non-adaptive setting of C3 (Fig. 16).

### B.4. Estimating the decoding complexity in MACs

Here we explain in more detail how we obtained the estimates for the decoding complexity. We report this value in terms of the number of multiply-accumulate operations (MACs) per pixel. We follow the convention that 1 MAC = 2 FLOPs, though note that this is not always consistently done in the literature.

We follow COOL-CHIC [43] and COOL-CHICv2 [48] and report theoretic MACs for applying the neural networks in our model, *i.e.*, matrix multiplications, but exclude pointwise operations such as non-linearities. We also include an estimate for bi-/trilinear upsampling.

COOL-CHICv2 uses `fvcore` [22] to automatically estimate the number of theoretic MACs in PyTorch [65]. We implement our method in JAX [10], which (to the best of our knowledge) does not easily allow for the automatic estimation of theoretic MACs/FLOPs. We therefore use back-of-the-envelope estimates as detailed below and confirm they agree with the numbers as reported by `fvcore` in a PyTorch codebase.

The MACs estimates for other baselines were obtained from various sources while ensuring the numbers were comparable with ours. For BMS [6], MBT [63] and CST [16], we calculated the MACs using the `fvcore` library on the CompressAI implementations of these models (measuring MACs only on the decoder of the model). For MLIC and MLIC+ [38], the numbers were directly provided to us by the authors, who calculated their numbers using the DeepSpeed library. For EVC [29], we used the numbers for the EVC-S, EVC-M and EVC-L models in the paper, which were obtained using the `ptflops` library.

**Bi- and trilinear upsampling** To upsample the latent grids we use bilinear upsampling for images and trilinear upsampling for videos, respectively. `fvcore` does not provide a complexity estimate for upsampling; we therefore use the following upper-bound estimates. We upper bound the complexity of bilinear upsampling with 8 MACs per output pixel; this estimate includes computing the weighted average of the values at the four closest grid points (4 MACs) and computation of the corresponding weights (4 MACs). Similarly, we upper bound the complexity of trilinear upsampling with 16 MACs per output pixel; this estimate includes computing the weighted average of the values at the eight closest grid points (8 MACs) and computation of the corresponding weights (8 MACs). Note that in practice, most of the weights can be pre-computed and cached, especially when we are upsampling by an exact factor of 2.

**Application of the entropy model.** While we implement the entropy as a convolutional network with a masked convolution as first layer and a sequence of  $1 \times 1$  convolutions during encoding, it can be equivalently evaluated as a feed-forward MLP where the context for each latent grid location is read from memory. Each latent grid location is evaluated independently in this case. Therefore, the cost of evaluating the entropy model on all latent entries is given by the cost of applying it to one entry multiplied by the number of latent values  $\mathcal{Z}$ , which is given by

$$\mathcal{Z} = \sum_n h_n \cdot w_n \quad (25)$$

where  $h_n$  and  $w_n$  are the height and width of latent grid  $n$ . The cost of applying the entropy model is the cost of applying all layers, which depends on the input, hidden, and output sizes. The cost in MACs of each single layer is simply the product of the input and output size,  $c_{\text{in}} \cdot c_{\text{out}}$ . The total complexity in MACs/pixel is then given by adding the contributions from all latent values and dividing them by the number of pixels.

We verify that the numbers we obtain for the application of the feed-forward MLP are the same as those reported by `fvcore` that is used by COOL-CHICv2. When estimating the cost of additionally conditioning on the previous grid, we need to take into account the larger input-size to the entropy network as well as the bilinear upsampling of the latent. We upper-bound the cost of the bilinear upsampling by  $\mathcal{Z} \cdot \text{cost}_{\text{one upsampling}}$  as we have to resample exactly one value from a previous grid for each current grid location. This is an upper bound because the first grid does not actually depend on a previous grid.

**Application of the synthesis model** The synthesis model  $f_\theta$  is a simple convolutional network with skip connections in its second part. The cost of applying a single convolutional layer at one location is

$$k \cdot k \cdot c_{\text{in}} \cdot c_{\text{out}}. \quad (26)$$

As the number of locations is given by the number of pixels, the above estimate is the cost of applying a single layer in MACs/pixel. We again evaluate the cost for different network sizes and verify that they agree with the numbers reported by `fvcore` when implementing them.

## C. Additional results

### C.1. Full RD curves with all baselines

We include several large-format RD-curve plots in which we compare C3 to:

Component	KODAK	CLIC	UVG
Entropy model	1600	1889	2540
Upsampling	48	48	80
Synthesis model	978	978	1798
Total	2626	2925	4418

Table 7. Maximum computational complexity in MACs/pixel of different components of C3 for the hyperparameters used in each dataset.




Figure 17. MACs/pixel vs BD-rate on CLIC2020. C3 performs well both in terms of BD-rate and decoding MACs/pixel, achieving a better trade off than existing neural codecs.

1. overfitted neural compression methods on the Kodak image benchmark in Fig. 18,
2. autoencoder based neural compression methods on the Kodak image benchmark in Fig. 19,
3. several additional baselines on the CLIC2020 image benchmark in Fig. 20, and
4. several additional baselines on the UVG video benchmark in Fig. 21.

**Image baselines.** In addition to the baselines used in the main paper, for images we also compare against<sup>1</sup>: COIN [20], SPY [75], COIN++ [21], MSCN [70], VC-INR [71], RECOMBINER [32], MBT [63], ELIC [31] and STF [89]. COOL-CHIC, COOL-CHICv2, COIN, COIN++ and STF results were obtained from official code implementations. MLIC, SPY, MSCN, VC-INR and RECOMBINER results were obtained from direct communication with the respective paper authors. BPG, VTM, BMS, MBT, CST and ELIC were obtained from CompressAI [7].

**Video baselines.** In addition to the baselines cited in the main paper, for videos we also include HEVC (HM 18.0, Random Access, default setting) [76], VTM (17.0, Random Access, default setting) [11], Insta-SSF18 [80] (bigger model than Insta-SSF5), DCVC [49], ELF-VC [69], NeRV [14] and HNeRV [15]. HEVC (RA), NeRV, HNeRV, FFNeRV and HiNeRV results were obtained from Kwan et al. [42] or direct communication with the authors. HEVC (medium, no B-frames), DCVC, ELF-VC and VCT results were obtained from direct communication with the authors of Mentzer et al. [59]. Insta-SSF5/18 and MIMT results were obtained directly from their papers. VTM (RA) results were obtained by running VTM 17.0 using the default setting of `encoder_randomaccess_vtm.cfg` [83].

**Discussion of the additional results.** From Fig. 18, we see that on the Kodak image benchmark, C3 is SOTA among methods based on overfitting neural fields to a single image instance by a noticeable margin, and is the only method that is competitive with VTM. From Fig. 19, we see that C3 is not as competitive as the more recent autoencoder-based methods in terms of RD, although the gap has been significantly reduced compared to COOL-CHICv2.

On CLIC2020, arguably a more realistic dataset than Kodak with images at higher resolution, we see in Fig. 20 that C3 *adaptive* outperforms VTM and is quite close to MLIC+, the best-performing baseline. We also show the plot of BD-rate against decoding complexity in Fig. 17; C3 performs much better in terms of RD performance compared to other baselines with a low decoding complexity such as COOL-CHICv2.

<sup>1</sup>We follow the CompressAI [7] convention of using the first letters of the first three authors for unnamed methods

On UVG, we show in Fig. 21 that C3 is also a competitive baseline for video compression, despite being the first one of its kind (in the COOL-CHIC line of work) to be applied to videos. Note that there is a clear room for improvement that is visible in the gap between C3 and stronger baselines such as HiNeRV and MIMT, however we emphasize again that C3 achieves its competitive performance with 2-3 orders of magnitude lower decoding complexity than these baselines (cf. Fig. 9).

## C.2. Encoding times

See Tab. 8 for details on encoding times for each dataset, showing the fastest and slowest settings among the hyperparameter settings in the adaptive sweeps. Note that the encoding time for CLIC2020 depends on the size of the image, hence we measure it on the largest image of resolution  $1370 \times 2048$ . We emphasize again that we do not optimize for encoding times and use unoptimized research code to obtain these encoding times.

Hyperparameter	Value	Encoding time (sec/1k steps)
Kodak – fastest setting		3.9
Context size (same grid)	$5 \times 5$	
Width of $1 \times 1$ convolutions (synthesis & entropy)	(12, 12)	
Use the highest resolution grid ( $t, h, w$ )?	✗	
Kodak – slowest setting		7.1
Context size (same grid)	$7 \times 7$	
Width of $1 \times 1$ convolutions (synthesis & entropy)	(24, 24)	
Use the highest resolution grid ( $t, h, w$ )?	✓	
CLIC2020 – fastest setting		21.5
Width of $1 \times 1$ convolutions (synthesis & entropy)	(12, 12)	
Use the highest resolution grid ( $t, h, w$ )?	✗	
CLIC2020 – slowest setting		48.0
Width of $1 \times 1$ convolutions (synthesis & entropy)	(24, 24)	
Use the highest resolution grid ( $t, h, w$ )?	✓	
UVG – fastest setting		28.7
Patch size	(30, 180, 240)	
Entropy setting	No conditioning	
Replace $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Conv with $3 \times 3$ Convs per frame	✓	
UVG – slowest setting		456.7
Patch size	(75, 270, 320)	
Entropy setting	Learned mask	
Replace $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Conv with $3 \times 3$ Convs per frame	✗	

Table 8. Encoding times for C3 measured on a single NVIDIA V100 GPU.

## C.3. RD curves for individual UVG videos

In Fig. 22, we include RD curves for individual UVG videos. Note that C3 tends to perform better than VCT for Beauty, Bosphorus, Honeybee, Shakendry and Yachtride, and even outperforms VTM (17.0, random access setting) on Beauty and Shakendry. However C3 appears to struggle with Jockey and Readysetgo, which are the video sequences with faster motion. While we show in App. D.4 that the learned mask helps to achieve a better RD performance, it would be interesting to investigate how the performance can be improved further especially on these sequences with fast motion.




Figure 18. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rate on the Kodak image benchmark comparing C3 to other overfitted neural field based compression methods, including those in Fig. 5. Note that we omit methods with very large values from the BD-rate plot on the right.




Figure 19. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rates on the Kodak image benchmark comparing C3 to autoencoder-based neural compression methods, including those in Fig. 5.




Figure 20. Rate-distortion curve and BD-rates of more baselines on CLIC2020, including those in Fig. 6.




Figure 21. Rate-distortion curve of more baselines on all UVG videos, including those in Fig. 8.




Figure 22. Rate-distortion curves for individual videos in UVG.

## D. Additional ablations

### D.1. CLIC2020 ablations

In Tab. 9 we show the ablations for CLIC2020 when sequentially removing each of our improvements from the best performing C3 Adaptive model, similarly to Tab. 2 for Kodak in the main paper. In Tab. 10, we show the results when disabling individual features from the C3 model, similar to Tab. 3 for Kodak in the main paper. We have an additional row for the previous grid conditioning described in App. A.1.4, since this option is only used for CLIC2020. The conclusions are similar in that soft-rounding, the GELU activation function and Kumaraswamy noise account for most of the boost in RD performance. Two minor differences for CLIC2020 are: 1) the quantization step is slightly more important than the remaining features compared to Kodak, 2) conditioning on the previous grid improves performance for CLIC2020. In Tab. 11 we ablate the annealing schedules for the soft-rounding temperature and the shape parameter of the Kumaraswamy noise. We find that fixing them to a single value leads to worse performance. A lower soft-rounding temperature results in a closer approximation of quantization but higher variance in the gradients. Annealing the temperature allows us to control this bias-variance trade-off over time, with less biased gradients becoming more important later in training. Also note that different shape parameters of the noise are optimal for different soft-rounding temperatures.




Table 9. CLIC2020 ablation sequentially removing methodological changes. Note that a higher BD-rate means worse RD performance relative to our default settings for C3.

Removed Feature	BD-rate vs. C3
C3 – Soft-rounding	24.87%
C3 – GELU	9.83%
C3 – Kumaraswamy noise	8.06%
C3 – Quantization step < 1	2.82%
C3 – Previous grid conditioning	1.50%
C3 – Shifted log-scale > 0	0.99%
C3 – Adaptive lr (Stage 2)	0.54%

Table 10. CLIC2020 ablation knocking out individual features from C3 (fixed hyperparameters across all images). Note that a higher BD-rate means worse RD performance relative to our default settings for C3.

### D.2. Effect of Stage 2

We also ablate the increase in performance that we can attribute to stage 2 of optimization, by comparing the default setting of C3 (both stage 1 + 2) vs only having stage 1. We find that the BD-rate with respect to VTM for these two settings is +1.39% vs +2.00% on the CLIC2020 benchmark. The gain in BD-rate for stage 2 is indeed not as significant as was observed for COOL-CHICv2 [48].

Soft-round temperature $T$	Kumaraswamy noise $a$	BD-rate vs. C3
0.1	1.0	88.48%
0.1	1.5	109.08%
0.1	2.0	129.96%
0.2	1.0	11.66%
0.2	1.5	5.66%
0.2	2.0	5.97%
0.3	1.0	10.32%
0.3	1.5	5.57%
0.3	2.0	9.78%

Table 11. Ablation of annealing schedules for the soft-rounding temperature and the shape parameter of the Kumaraswamy noise on CLIC2020. Instead of annealing the soft-rounding temperature from 0.3 to 0.1 and the Kumaraswamy noise parameter from 2 to 1, we clamp them at the fixed value specified in the table. A higher BD-rate corresponds to worse RD performance relative to C3 with annealing.

### D.3. BD-rate vs encoding iterations/time evaluation for CLIC and UVG

In Fig. 23 we show how the BD-rate of C3 changes as a function of the number of encoding iterations for both CLIC2020 and the Shakendry sequence of UVG. Note that with around 20 – 30k iterations, we can approach the BD-rate of the default setting (100k iterations).




Figure 23. Ablation on the effect of using different number of encoding iterations in Stage 1 of the optimization. We evaluate the BD-rate (right) vs VTM (lower BD-rate values are better) on CLIC2020 and (left) vs HEVC on the Shakendry sequence of UVG. The number of encoding iterations in Stage 2 is determined adaptively but set to be at most 10% of the number of iterations in Stage 1.

### D.4. Video ablations

Settings	BD-rate vs. HEVC (medium)
Single setting: <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 1</span> <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">S 1</span>	-7.67%
3 settings: single setting for <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">S 1</span> but sweep <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 1</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 2</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 3</span>	-21.44%
9 settings (default): sweep all combinations of <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 1</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 2</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">E 3</span> and <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">S 1</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">S 2</span> , <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">S 3</span>	-28.89%

Table 12. UVG ablation for the 9 hyperparameter settings used (cf. App. A.4). Note that lower BD-rate means better RD performance.

In Fig. 24, we highlight the importance of learning the mask by comparing the rate and distortion values when using different custom mask locations for the previous latent grid. Among the four different choices of mask locations, we see that




Figure 24. Comparison of (bpp, psnr) when training with different mask locations for the previous latent frame on the Jockey patch in Fig. 13. The different locations are colour coded as follows: learned (—), top-left (—), center (—), diametrically opposed to learned (—),

the learned mask (same as mask shown in Fig. 15) achieves the best RD values.

In Tab. 12, we show an ablation for how the BD-rate changes when we use a subset of the 9 settings used for the video experiments on the UVG dataset (see Tab. 6 for details on the 9 settings). We see that varying the entropy settings and the synthesis settings are both important for improvements in performance.

## E. Additional visualizations

In this section, we show visualizations of C3 reconstructions and latents for both images and video.

**Reconstruction with C3**



**Reconstruction with COOL-CHICv2**



Figure 25. Qualitative comparison between C3 (top) and COOL-CHIC v2 (bottom). The PSNR for C3 is 30.28dB and the PSNR for COOL-CHIC v2 is 28.98dB.




Figure 26. *Top:* Reconstruction and visualization of C3’s latents for kodim19 at a high bit-rate (1.413 bpp). The first row shows reconstructions when all but one out of 7 sets of latents is set to zero. For example, the highest resolution latent grid appears to encode luminance information. The second row visualizes the raw latents, upsampled to match the resolution of the output. *Bottom:* As above but at a lower rate (0.079 bpp).




Figure 27. Reconstructions of a frame of Bosphorus from the UVG dataset for various models. Adapted from Figure 9 of Kwan et al. [42].




Figure 28. C3 latents of the first four grids corresponding to the frame in Fig. 27. Note that the highest resolution grid (top left) are mostly zeros, hence highly compressible. Also note that we see patch artifacts in the latents because each patch has been optimized independently, so we have different parameter values for the synthesis and entropy models of each patch. However we see in Fig. 27 that these artifacts are not visible in reconstructions even for bpp values around 0.05.

## F. Raw values

In this section we provide the raw values for the RD-curves of C3 on all benchmarks.

Rate [bits per pixel]	PSNR [dB]	Rate [bits per pixel]	PSNR [dB]
0.0938	27.124	0.0791	27.049
0.1351	28.492	0.1228	28.383
0.1552	28.993	0.1427	28.860
0.2041	30.058	0.1937	29.923
0.2333	30.602	0.2241	30.472
0.2785	31.337	0.2709	31.240
0.3527	32.436	0.3493	32.389
0.5181	34.391	0.5175	34.404
0.5808	35.039	0.5804	35.053
0.7309	36.393	0.7296	36.408
0.8162	37.008	0.8067	37.059
0.9217	37.835	0.9135	37.895
1.0977	38.896	1.0812	39.033
1.4105	40.869	1.4081	40.918

(a) C3

(b) C3 *adaptive*

Table 13. Raw values of our proposed method, C3, on the Kodak image benchmark.

Rate [bits per pixel]	PSNR [dB]	Rate [bits per pixel]	PSNR [dB]
0.0623	29.159	0.0542	29.090
0.0926	30.541	0.0861	30.532
0.1058	31.004	0.0995	31.011
0.1405	32.036	0.1343	32.019
0.1610	32.502	0.1557	32.537
0.1908	33.176	0.1860	33.181
0.2408	34.079	0.2369	34.109
0.3517	35.716	0.3470	35.700
0.3952	36.242	0.3915	36.240
0.4994	37.336	0.4974	37.328
0.5649	37.804	0.5560	37.827
0.6501	38.470	0.6443	38.520
0.7841	39.445	0.7798	39.460
1.0723	40.959	1.0665	41.006

(a) C3

(b) C3 *adaptive*

Table 14. Raw values of our proposed method, C3, on the CLIC2020 professional validation dataset split image benchmark.

<b>Rate [bits per pixel]</b>		<b>PSNR [dB]</b>	
0.0159	32.926		
0.0227	33.967		
0.0331	35.027		
0.0546	36.328		
0.0846	37.450		
0.1276	38.364		
0.2540	39.705		
0.4425	40.795		
(a) C3 on all UVG videos			
<b>Rate [bits per pixel]</b>		<b>PSNR [dB]</b>	
0.0101	32.975	0.0103	35.567
0.0124	33.410	0.0143	36.722
0.0161	33.735	0.0203	37.919
0.0242	34.065	0.0325	39.322
0.0420	34.289	0.0530	40.383
0.1082	34.936	0.0737	41.239
0.4446	36.891	0.1382	42.429
0.9688	38.808	0.2078	43.286
(b) C3 on Beauty		(c) C3 on Bosphorus	
<b>Rate [bits per pixel]</b>		<b>PSNR [dB]</b>	
0.0154	31.971	0.0344	29.710
0.0217	33.017	0.0502	31.278
0.0321	34.098	0.0732	32.884
0.0551	35.462	0.1182	34.938
0.0861	36.861	0.1685	36.799
0.1289	37.866	0.2376	38.199
0.2235	39.126	0.3640	40.092
0.3799	40.033	0.5231	41.219
(e) C3 on Jockey		(f) C3 on Readystego	
<b>Rate [bits per pixel]</b>		<b>PSNR [dB]</b>	
0.0212	31.529		
0.0328	32.923		
0.0512	34.475		
0.0892	36.520		
0.1353	38.208		
0.1930	39.616		
0.3088	41.375		
0.4301	42.480		
(h) C3 on Yachtride			
<b>Rate [bits per pixel]</b>		<b>PSNR [dB]</b>	
8.8842 · 10 <sup>-3</sup>	35.782		
0.0107	36.516		
0.0131	37.126		
0.0179	37.793		
0.0313	38.392		
0.0414	38.736		
0.0888	39.198		
0.1987	39.889		
(d) C3 on Honeybee		(g) C3 on Shakendry	

Table 15. Raw values of our proposed method, C3, UVG video benchmark; average rate and PSNR over the seven 1080p videos.