

000  
001  
002054  
055  
056

# External Prior Guided Internal Prior Learning for Real Noisy Image Denoising

057  
058  
059003  
004  
005  
006  
007  
008  
009  
010  
011060  
061  
062  
063  
064  
065

Anonymous CVPR submission

012

066

013

067  
068014  
015  
016  
017  
018  
019  
020  
021  
022  
023  
024  
025  
026  
027  
028  
029  
030  
031  
032  
033  
034  
035  
036  
037  
038  
039  
040  
041  
042  
043  
044  
045  
046  
047  
048  
049  
050  
051  
052  
053069  
070  
071  
072  
073  
074  
075  
076  
077  
078  
079  
080  
081  
082  
083  
084  
085  
086  
087  
088  
089  
090  
091  
092  
093

## Abstract

Most of existing image denoising methods use some statistical models such as additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) to model the noise, and learn image priors from either external data or the noisy image itself to remove noise. However, the noise in real-world noisy images is much more complex than AWGN, and it is hard to be modeled by simple analytical distributions. Therefore, many state-of-the-art denoising methods in literature become much less effective when applied to real noisy images. In this paper, we develop a robust denoiser for real noisy image denoising without explicit assumption on noise models. Specifically, we first learn external priors from a set of clean natural images, and then use the learned external priors to guide the learning of internal latent priors from the given noisy image. The proposed method is simple yet highly effective. Experiments on real noisy images demonstrate that it achieves much better denoising performance than state-of-the-art denoising methods, including those designed for real noisy images.

## 1. Introduction

Image denoising is a crucial and indispensable step to improve image quality in digital imaging systems. In particular, with the decrease of size of CMOS/CCD sensors, noise is more easily to be corrupted and hence denoising is becoming increasingly important for high resolution imaging. In literature of image denoising, the observed noisy image is usually modeled as  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}$ , where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the latent clean image and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the corrupted noise. Numerous image denoising methods [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] have been proposed in the past decades, including sparse representation and dictionary learning based methods [1, 2, 3], nonlocal self-similarity based methods [4, 5, 6, 3, 7], low-rank based methods [8], neural network based methods [9], and discriminative learning based methods [10, 11].

Most of the existing denoising methods [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] mentioned above assume noise  $\mathbf{n}$  to be additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN). Unfortunately, this assumption is too ideal to be true for real-world noisy im-

ages, where the noise is much more complex than AWGN [14, 15] and varies by different cameras and camera settings (ISO, shutter speed, and aperture, etc.). According to [15], the noise corrupted in the imaging process [is signal dependent and comes from five main sources: photon shot, fixed pattern, dark current, readout, and quantization noise. As a result, many advanced denoising methods in literature becomes much less effective when applied to real-world noisy images. Fig. 1 shows an example, where we apply some representative and state-of-the-art denoising methods, including CBM3D [6], WNNM [8], MLP [9], CSF [10], and TRD [11], to a real noisy image (captured by a Nikon D800 camera with ISO is 3200) provided in [14]. One can see that these methods either remain the noise or over-smooth the image details on this real noisy image.

There have been a few methods [16, 17, 18, 14, 19, 20, 21] developed for real noisy image denoising. Almost all of these methods follow a two-stage framework: first estimate the parameters of the assumed noise model (usually Gaussian or mixture of Gaussians (MoG)), and then perform denoising with the estimated noise model. Again, the noise in real noisy images is very complex and hard to be modeled by explicit distributions such as Gaussian and MoG. Fig. 1 also shows the denoised results of two state-of-the-art real noisy image denoising methods, Noise Clinic [19, 20] and Neat Image [21]. One can see that these two methods do not perform well on this noisy image either.

This work aims to develop a robust solution for real noisy image denoising without explicitly assuming certain noise models. To achieve this goal, we propose to first learn image priors from external clean images, and then employ the learned external priors to guide the learning of internal latent priors from the given noisy image. The flowchart of the proposed method is illustrated in Fig. 2. We first extract millions of patch groups from a set of high quality natural images, with which a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is learned as the external prior. The learned GMM prior model is used to cluster the patch groups extracted from the given noisy image, and then a hybrid orthogonal dictionary (HOD) is learned as the internal prior for image denoising. Our proposed denoising method is simple and ef-




Figure 1. Denoised images of the real noisy image “Nikon D800 ISO 3200 A3” from [14] by different methods. The images are better viewed by zooming in on screen.

ficient, yet our extensive experiments on real noisy images clearly demonstrate its better denoising performance than the current state-of-the-arts.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Internal vs. External Prior Learning

Image priors are playing a key role in image denoising [7, 13, 1, 22, 3, 23]. There are mainly two categories of prior learning methods. 1) External prior learning methods [12, 7, 13] learn priors (e.g., dictionaries) from a set of external clean images, and the learned priors are used to recover the latent clean image from noisy images. 2) Internal prior learning methods [1, 3, 22, 23] directly learn priors from the given noisy image, and the image denoising is often done simultaneously with the prior learning process. It has been demonstrated [7, 13] that the external priors learned from natural clean images are effective and efficient for image denoising problem, but they are not adaptive to the given noisy image so that some fine-scale image structures may not be well recovered. By contrast, the internal priors are adaptive to content of the given image, but the learning processing are usually slow. In addition, most of the internal prior learning methods [1, 3, 22, 23] assume AWGN noise, making the learned priors less robust for real noisy images. In this paper, we use external priors to guide the internal prior learning. Our method is not only much faster than the traditional internal learning methods, but also very effective to denoise real noisy images.

### 2.2. Real Noisy Image Denoising

In the last decade, there are many methods [16, 17, 19, 20, 18, 14] for blind image denoising problem. These meth-

ods can be applied to real noisy image denoising directly. Liu *et al.* [16] proposed to use “noise level function” to estimate the noise and then use Gaussian conditional random field to obtain the latent clean image. Gong et al. [17] models the noise by mixed  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  norms and remove the noise by sparsity prior in the wavelet transform domain. Recently, Zhu et al. proposed a Bayesian model [18] which approximates and removes the noise via low-rank mixture of Gaussians. The method of “Noise Clinic” [19, 20] and the software of Neat Image [21] are developed specifically for real noisy image denoising. “Noise Clinic” [19, 20] generalizes the NL-Bayes model [24] to deal with blind noise and achieves state-of-the-art performance. However, these methods largely depends on the modeling of noise in real noisy images which is hard to be modeled by explicit distributions. Besides, the parametric estimation of the Gaussian or MoG distribution is often time consuming.

## 3. External Prior Guided Internal Prior Learning

In this section, we first describe the learning of external prior, and then describe in detail the guided internal prior learning. Finally, the denoising algorithm with the learned priors is presented.

### 3.1. Learn External Patch Group Priors

The nonlocal self-similarity based patch group (PG) [7] has proved to be a very effective unit for image prior learning. In this work, we also extract PGs from natural clean images to learn priors. A PG is a group of similar patches to a local patch.

In our method, each local patch is extracted from a




Figure 2. Flowchart of the proposed external prior guided internal prior learning and real noisy image denoising framework.

RGB image with patch size  $p \times p \times 3$ . We search the  $M$  most similar patches to this local patch (including the local patch itself) in a  $W \times W$  local region around it. Each patch is stretched to a patch vector  $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{3p^2 \times 1}$  to form the PG  $\{\mathbf{x}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ . The mean vector of this PG is  $\mu = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{x}_m$ , and the group mean subtracted PG is defined as  $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \triangleq \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_m = \mathbf{x}_m - \mu\}$ .

Assume we extract a number of  $N$  PGs from a set of external natural images, and the  $n$ -th PG is  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n \triangleq \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{n,m}\}_{m=1}^M, n = 1, \dots, N$ . A Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is learned to model the PG prior. The overall log-likelihood function is

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = \sum_{n=1}^N \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \prod_{m=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{n,m} | \mu_k, \Sigma_k) \right). \quad (1)$$

The learning process is similar to the GMM learning in [7, 13]. Finally, a GMM model with  $K$  Gaussian components is learned, and the learned parameters include mixture weights  $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , mean vectors  $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , and covariance matrices  $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k=1}^K$ . Note that the mean vector of each cluster is naturally zero, i.e.,  $\mu_k = \mathbf{0}$ .

To better describe the subspace of each Gaussian component, we perform singular value decomposition (SVD) on the covariance matrix:

$$\Sigma_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{S}_k \mathbf{U}_k^\top. \quad (2)$$

The eigenvector matrices  $\{\mathbf{U}_k\}_{k=1}^K$  will be employed as the external orthogonal dictionary to guide the internal dictionary learning in next sub-section. In Fig. 4 (a) and (b), we

illustrate an external clean image and one orthogonal dictionary learned via GMM on PGs of the external clean image. The singular values in  $\mathbf{S}_k$  reflect the significance of the singular vectors in  $\mathbf{U}_k$ . They will also be utilized as prior weights for weighted sparse coding in our denoising algorithm.

### 3.2. Guided Internal Prior Learning

After the external PG prior is learned, we employ it to guide the internal PG prior learning for a given real noisy image. The guidance lies in two aspects. One is that the external prior can guide the subspace assignment of internal noisy PGs, while the other is that the external prior could guide the orthogonal dictionary learning of internal noisy PGs.

#### 3.2.1 Internal Subspace Assignment

Given a real noisy image, we extract  $N$  (overlapped) local patches from it. Similar to the external prior learning stage, for the  $n$ -th local patch we search its  $M$  most similar patches around it to form a noisy PG, denoted by  $\mathbf{Y}_n = \{\mathbf{y}_{n,1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{n,M}\}$ . Then the group mean of  $\mathbf{Y}_n$ , denoted by  $\mu_n$ , is subtracted from each patch by  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m} = \mathbf{y}_{n,m} - \mu_n$ , leading to the mean subtracted noisy PG  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n \triangleq \{\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}\}_{m=1}^M$ .

The external GMM prior models  $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k=1}^K$  basically characterize the subspaces of natural high quality PGs. Therefore, we project the noisy PG  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n$  into the subspaces of  $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k=1}^K$  and assign it to the most suitable subspace

216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323

324

based on the posterior probability:

$$P(k|\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n) = \frac{\prod_{m=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}|\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_k)}{\sum_{l=1}^K \prod_{m=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}|\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_l)} \quad (3)$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Then  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n$  is assigned to the component with the maximum A-posteriori (MAP) probability  $\max_k P(k|\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n)$ .

### 3.2.2 Guided Orthogonal Dictionary Learning

Assume we have assigned all the internal noisy PGs  $\{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n\}_{n=1}^N$  to their corresponding most suitable subspaces in  $\{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_k)\}_{k=1}^K$ . For the  $k$ -th subspace, the noisy PGs assigned to it are  $\{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n}\}_{n=1}^{N_k}$  where  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n} = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k,n,1}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k,n,M}]$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K N_k = N$ . We propose to learn an orthogonal dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_k$  from each set of PGs  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n}$  with the guidance of the corresponding external orthogonal dictionary  $\mathbf{U}_k$  (Eq. (2)) to characterize the internal PG prior. The reasons that we learn orthogonal dictionaries are two-fold. Firstly, the PGs  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n}$  are in a subspace of the whole space of all PGs, therefore, there is no necessary to learn a redundant over-complete dictionary to characterize it, while an orthonormal dictionary has naturally zero *mutual incoherence* [25]. Secondly, the orthogonality of dictionary can make the encoding in the testing stage very efficient, leading to an efficient denoising algorithm (please refer to sub-section 3.3 for details).

We let the orthogonal dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_k$  be  $\mathbf{D}_k \triangleq [\mathbf{D}_{k,E} \ \mathbf{D}_{k,I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{3p^2 \times 3p^2}$ , where  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E} = \mathbf{U}_k(:, 1:r) \in \mathbb{R}^{3p^2 \times r}$  is the external sub-dictionary and it includes the first  $r$  most important eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{U}_k$ , and the internal sub-dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_{k,I}$  is to be adaptively learned from the noisy PGs  $\{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n}\}_{n=1}^{N_k}$ . The rationale to design  $\mathbf{D}_k$  as a hybrid dictionary is as follows. The external sub-dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E}$  is pre-trained from external clean data, and it represents the  $k$ -th latent subspace of natural images, which is helpful to reconstruct the common latent structures of images. However,  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E}$  is general to all images and it is not adaptive to the given noisy image. Some fine-scale details specific to the given image may not be well characterized by  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E}$ . Therefore, we learn an internal sub-dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_{k,I}$  to supplement  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E}$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{D}_{k,I}$  is to reveal the latent subspace adaptive to the input noisy image, which cannot be effectively represented by  $\mathbf{D}_{k,E}$ .

For notation simplicity, in the following development we ignore the subspace index  $k$  for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k,n}$  and  $\mathbf{D}_k$ , etc. The learning of hybrid orthogonal dictionary  $\mathbf{D}$  is performed under the following weighted sparse coding framework:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{D}, \{\alpha_{n,m}\}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M (\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m} - \mathbf{D}\alpha_{n,m}\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{3p^2} \lambda_j |\alpha_{n,m,j}|) \\ & \text{s.t. } \mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{D}_E \ \mathbf{D}_I], \mathbf{D}_I^\top \mathbf{D}_I = \mathbf{I}_r, \mathbf{D}_E^\top \mathbf{D}_I = \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha_{n,m}$  is the sparse coding vector of the  $m$ -th patch  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}$  in the  $n$ -th PG  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n$  and  $\alpha_{n,m,j}$  is the  $j$ -th element of  $\alpha_{n,m}$ .  $\lambda_j$  is the  $j$ -th regularization parameter defined as

$$\lambda_j = \lambda / (\sqrt{\mathbf{S}_k(j)} + \varepsilon), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_k(j)$  is the  $j$ -th singular value of diagonal singular value matrix  $\mathbf{S}_k$  (please refer to Eq. (2)) and  $\varepsilon$  is a small positive number to avoid zero denominator. Noted that  $\mathbf{D}_E = \mathbf{U}_k$  if  $r = 3p^2$  and  $\mathbf{D}_E = \emptyset$  if  $r = 0$ . The dictionary  $\mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{D}_E \ \mathbf{D}_I]$  is orthogonal by checking that:

$$\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_E^\top \\ \mathbf{D}_I^\top \end{bmatrix} [\mathbf{D}_E \ \mathbf{D}_I] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_E^\top \mathbf{D}_E & \mathbf{D}_E^\top \mathbf{D}_I \\ \mathbf{D}_I^\top \mathbf{D}_E & \mathbf{D}_I^\top \mathbf{D}_I \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{I} \quad (6)$$

We employ an alternating iterative approach to solve the optimization problem (4). Specifically, we initialize the orthogonal dictionary as  $\mathbf{D}^{(0)} = \mathbf{U}_k$  and for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ , we alternatively update  $\alpha_{n,m}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  as follows:

**Updating Sparse Coefficient:** Given the orthogonal dictionary  $\mathbf{D}^{(t)}$ , we update each sparse coding vector  $\alpha_{n,m}$  by solving

$$\alpha_{n,m}^{(t)} := \arg \min_{\alpha_{n,m}} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m} - \mathbf{D}^{(t)} \alpha_{n,m}\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{3p^2} \lambda_j |\alpha_{n,m,j}| \quad (7)$$

Since dictionary  $\mathbf{D}^{(t)}$  is orthogonal, the problems (7) has a closed-form solution

$$\alpha_{n,m}^{(t)} = \text{sgn}((\mathbf{D}^{(t)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}) \odot \max(|(\mathbf{D}^{(t)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}| - \lambda, 0), \quad (8)$$

where  $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{3p^2}]$  is the vector of regularization parameter and  $\text{sgn}(\bullet)$  is the sign function,  $\odot$  means element-wise multiplication. The detailed derivation of Eq. (8) can be found in the supplementary file.

**Updating Internal Sub-dictionary:** Given the sparse coding vectors  $\alpha_{n,m}^{(t)}$ , we update the internal sub-dictionary by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_I^{(t+1)} &:= \arg \min_{\mathbf{D}_I} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M (\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m} - \mathbf{D} \alpha_{n,m}^{(t)}\|_2^2) \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{D}_I} \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A}^{(t)}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{D}_E \ \mathbf{D}_I], \mathbf{D}_I^\top \mathbf{D}_I = \mathbf{I}_r, \mathbf{D}_E^\top \mathbf{D}_I = \mathbf{0},$$

where  $\mathbf{A}^{(t)} = [\alpha_{1,1}^{(t)}, \dots, \alpha_{1,M}^{(t)}, \dots, \alpha_{N,1}^{(t)}, \dots, \alpha_{N,M}^{(t)}]$ . The sparse coefficient matrix can be written as  $\mathbf{A}^{(t)} = [(\mathbf{A}_E^{(t)})^\top \ (\mathbf{A}_I^{(t)})^\top]^\top$  where the external part  $\mathbf{A}_E^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(3p^2-r) \times NM}$  and the internal part  $\mathbf{A}_I^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times NM}$  represent the coding coefficients of  $\mathbf{Y}$  over external sub-dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_E$  and internal sub-dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_I$ , respectively. According to the Theorem 4 in [26], the problem (9) has a closed-form solution  $\mathbf{D}_I^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{U}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3p^2 \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  are the orthogonal matrices obtained by the following SVD

432   **Alg. 1:** External Prior Guided Internal Prior Learning  
 433    for Real Noisy Image Denoising  
 434  
 435    **Input:** Noisy image  $\mathbf{y}$ , external PG prior GMM model  
 436    **Output:** The denoised image  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ .  
 437    **Initialization:**  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)} = \mathbf{y}$ ;  
 438    **for**  $Ite = 1 : IteNum$  **do**  
 439      1. Extracting internal PGs from  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(Ite-1)}$ ;  
 440      **for** each PG  $\mathbf{Y}_n$  **do**  
 441       2. Calculate group mean vector  $\mu_n$  and form  
 442       mean subtracted PG  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n$ ;  
 443       3. Subspace selection via Eq. (3);  
 444      **end for**  
 445      **for** the PGs in each Subspace **do**  
 446       4. External PG prior Guided Internal Orthogonal  
 447       Dictionary Learning by solving (4);  
 448       5. Recover each patch in all PGs via Eq. (11);  
 449      **end for**  
 450      6. Aggregate the recovered PGs of all subspaces to form  
 451       the recovered image  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(Ite)}$ ;  
 452    **end for**

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}_e \mathbf{D}_e^\top) \mathbf{Y} (\mathbf{A}_i^{(t)})^\top = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top. \quad (10)$$

453  
 454   The orthogonality of internal dictionary  $\mathbf{D}_i^{(t+1)}$  can be  
 455   checked by  $(\mathbf{D}_i^{(t+1)})^\top (\mathbf{D}_i^{(t+1)}) = \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{U}_i^\top \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{V}_i^\top = \mathbf{I}_r$ . In Fig. 4 (c) and (d), we illustrate a denoised image by  
 456   our proposed method and one internal orthogonal dictionary  
 457   learned from PGs of the given noisy image.  
 458

### 3.3. The Denoising Algorithm

463   The denoising of the given noisy image can be simultaneously done with the guided internal dictionary learning  
 464   process. Once we obtain the solutions of sparse coding  
 465   vectors  $\{\hat{\alpha}_{n,m}^{(T-1)}\}$  in Eq. (8) and the orthogonal dictionary  
 466    $\mathbf{D}_{(T)} = [\mathbf{D}_E \mathbf{D}_I^{(T)}]$  in Eq. (9), the latent clean patch of a  
 467   noisy patch  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m}$  in PG  $\mathbf{Y}_n$  is reconstructed as  
 468

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{n,m} = \mathbf{D}_{(T)} \hat{\alpha}_{n,m} + \mu_n, \quad (11)$$

469  
 470   where  $\mu_n$  is the group mean of  $\mathbf{Y}_n$ . The latent clean image  
 471   is then reconstructed by aggregating all the reconstructed  
 472   patches in all PGs. We perform the above denoising pro-  
 473   cedures for several iterations for better denoising outputs.  
 474   The proposed denoising algorithm is summarized in Alg. 1.  
 475   The latent clean image  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  is reconstructed by aggregating all  
 476   the estimated PGs. Similar to [7], we perform the above de-  
 477   noising procedures for several iterations for better denoising  
 478   outputs. The proposed denoising algorithm is summarized  
 479   in Alg. 1.  
 480

## 4. Experiments

481  
 482   We evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm  
 483   on real-world noisy images [14, 20] in comparison with  
 484

485   state-of-the-art denoising methods [5, 6, 9, 8, 10, 11, 14,  
 486   19, 20, 21].  
 487

### 4.1. Implementation Details

488   Our proposed method has two stages: the external prior  
 489   learning stage and the external prior guided internal prior  
 490   learning stage. In the first stage, we set  $p = 6$  (the  
 491   patch size),  $M = 10$  (the number of similar patches in  
 492   a PG),  $W = 31$  (the window size for PG searching) and  
 493    $K = 32$  (the number of Gaussian components in GMM).  
 494   We learn the external GMM prior with 3.6 million PGs ex-  
 495   tracted from the Kodak PhotoCD Dataset (<http://r0k.us/graphics/kodak/>), which includes 24 high quality  
 496   color images.  
 497

498   In the second stage, we set  $r = 54$  (the number of atoms  
 499   in the external sub-dictionaries); that is, we let the external  
 500   sub-dictionary have the same number of atoms as the internal  
 501   sub-dictionary to be learned. Our experiments show that  
 502   setting  $r$  between 27 and 81 will lead to very similar results.  
 503   For other parameters, we set  $\lambda = 0.001$  (the sparse regu-  
 504   larization parameter),  $T = 2$  (the number of iterations for  
 505   solving problem (4)), and  $IteNum = 4$  (the number of iter-  
 506   ations for Alg.1). All parameters of our method are fixed to  
 507   all experiments, which are run under the Matlab2014b en-  
 508   vironment on a machine with Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-5930K  
 509   CPU of 3.5GHz and 32GB RAM.  
 510

### 4.2. The Testing Datasets

511   We evaluate the proposed method on two real noisy im-  
 512   age datasets, where the images were captured under indoor  
 513   or outdoor lighting conditions by different types of cameras  
 514   and camera settings.  
 515

516   The first dataset is provided in [20], which includes 20  
 517   real noisy images collected under uncontrolled outdoor en-  
 518   vironment. Since there is no “ground truth” of the noisy  
 519   images, the objective measures such as PSNR cannot be  
 520   computed on this dataset.  
 521

522   The second dataset is provided in [14], which includes  
 523   noisy images of 17 static scenes. The noisy images were  
 524   collected under controlled indoor environment. Each scene  
 525   was shot 500 times under the same camera and camera set-  
 526   ting. The mean image of the 500 shots is roughly taken as  
 527   the “ground truth”, with which the PSNR can be computed.  
 528   Since the image size is very large (about  $7000 \times 5000$ ) and  
 529   the 17 scenes share repetitive contents, the authors of [14]  
 530   cropped 15 smaller images (of size  $512 \times 512$ ) to perform  
 531   experiments. To more comprehensively evaluate the pro-  
 532   posed methods, we cropped 60 images of size  $500 \times 500$   
 533   from the dataset for experiments. Some samples are shown  
 534   in Fig. 4. Note that the noise in our cropped 60 images  
 535   is different from the noise in the 15 images cropped by the  
 536   authors of [14] since they are from different shots.  
 537



Figure 3. Some samples cropped from real noisy images of [14].  
Table 1. Average PSNR (dB) results and Run Time (seconds) of the External, the Internal, and our proposed methods on 60 real noisy images (of size  $500 \times 500 \times 3$ ) cropped from [14].

	Noisy	External	Internal	Guided Internal
PSNR	34.51	38.21	38.07	<b>38.75</b>
Time	—	<b>39.57</b>	667.36	41.89

### 4.3. Comparison among external, internal and guided internal priors

To demonstrate the advantages of external prior guided internal priors, in this section we perform real noisy image denoising by using external priors (denoted by “External”), internal priors (denoted by “Internal”), and the proposed guided internal priors (denoted by “Guided Internal”), respectively. For the “External” method, we utilize the full external dictionaries (i.e.,  $r = 108$  in Eq. (4)) for denoising. For the “Internal” method, the overall framework is similar to the method of [3]. A GMM model (with  $K = 32$  Gaussians) is directly learned from the PGs extracted from the given noisy image without using any external data, and then the internal orthogonal dictionary is obtained via Eqn. (2) to perform denoising. All parameters of the “External” and “Internal” methods are tuned to achieve their best performance.

We compare the three methods mentioned above on the 60 cropped images from [14]. The average PSNR and run time are listed in Table 1. It can be seen that “Guided Internal” prior achieves better PSNR than both “External” and “Internal” priors. In addition, the “Internal” method is very slow because it involves online GMM learning, while the “Guided Internal” method is only a little slower than the “External” method. Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 show the denoised images of two noisy image by the three methods. We can see that the “External” method is good at recovering large-scale structures (see Fig. 5) while the “Internal” method is good at recovering fine-scale textures (see Fig. 6). By utilizing external priors to guide the internal prior learning, our proposed method can effectively recover both the large-scale structures and fine-scale textures.

### 4.4. Comparison with State-of-the-Art Denoising Methods

We compare the proposed method with state-of-the-art image denoising methods, including CBM3D [5, 6], WNNM [8], MLP [9], CSF [10], TNRD [11], Noise Clinic (NC) [19], Cross-Channel (CC) [14], and Neat Image (NI) [21]. Among them, CBM3D, WNNM, MLP, CSF and

TNRD are designed based on Gaussian noise model, and they need to know the noise level for denoising. We use the method in [27] to estimate the noise level for them. All the other parameters in these methods are set as the default ones. Since WNNM, MLP, CSF and TNRD are designed for grayscale images, we use them to denoise the R, G, B channels separately for color noisy images.

Like our method, the NC is a blind image denoising method which does not need any noise prior. The NI is a commercial software for image denoising, which has been embedded into Photoshop and Corel PaintShop [21]. The code of CC is not released but its results on the 15 cropped images are available at [14]. Therefore, we only compare with it on the 15 cropped images from [14].

#### 4.4.1 Results on Dataset [20]

The real noisy images in the dataset [20] do not have “ground truth” images. On this dataset, we compare the proposed method with the methods of BM3D [5], WNNM [8], MLP [9], TRD [11], Noise Clinic (NC) [19], and Neat Image (NI) [21]. We only compare the visual quality of the denoised images. Fig. 6 shows the denoised images of “Dog” by the competing methods. More visual comparisons can be found in the supplementary file. It can be seen that the methods of BM3D, WNNM tend to globally oversmooth the image while locally remain some noise, while the methods of MLP, TRD are likely to remain noise in the whole image. This demonstrates that the methods designed for Gaussian noise are not effective for removing the complex noise in real noisy images. Though Noise Clinic and Neat Image are specifically developed for removing complex noise, they would sometimes fail to recover real noisy images. However, our proposed method recovers more faithfully the structures and textures (such as the eye area) than the other competing methods.

#### 4.4.2 Comparison on the Second Dataset [14]

The real noisy images in the second dataset [14] have corresponding “ground truth” images. On this dataset, we firstly perform comparison on the 15 cropped images used in [14]. The compared method are BM3D [5], WNNM [8], MLP [9], CSF [10], TRD [11], Noise Clinic (NC) [19], and Cross-Channel (CC) [14]. The PSNR values are listed in Table 2. As we can see, on most (9 out of the 15) images captured by different cameras and camera settings, our proposed method obtains better PSNR values than the other methods. Noted that, though in [14] a specific model is trained for each camera and camera setting, our proposed general method still gains 0.28dB improvements on PNSR over [14]. We also compare the visual quality of the denoised images by the competing methods. Fig. 7 shows the denoised images of a scene captured by Canon 5D Mark

594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647




Figure 4. Denoised images of the image “Dog” by different methods. The images are better to be zoomed in on screen.




Figure 5. Denoised images of the 96-th cropped image from “Nikon D600 ISO 3200 C1” [14] by different methods. The images are better to be zoomed in on screen.

3 at ISO = 3200 by the competing methods. More visual comparisons can be found in the supplementary file. We can see that BM3D, WNNM, NC, NI, and CC would either remain noise or generate artifacts, while MLP, TRD are likely to over-smooth the image. By combining the external and internal priors, our proposed method preserves edges and textures better than other methods.

To evaluate the compared methods on more samples, we then perform denoising experiments on the 60 smaller images cropped from the 17 images provided in [14]. The average PSNR results are listed in Table 3 (the code of [14] is not available so that it is not compared). The numbers in red color and blue color are the best and second best results, respectively. It can be seen that our proposed method achieves much better PSNR results than the other methods. The improvement of our method over the second best method (TRD) is 1dB. Due to the spacial limitations, the visual comparisions are provided in the supplementary file.

## 5. Conclusion and Future Work

Image priors are important for solving image denoising problems. The external priors learned from external clean images are generally effective to most images, while the internal priors learned directly from the noisy image are adaptive to the given image but would be biased by the complex noise in real noisy images. In this paper, we demonstrates that, once unifying both the priors in external clean images and internal noisy images, we can achieve much better while still efficient performance on real image denoising problem. Specifically, the external patch group (PG) priors learned on natural clean images can be used to guide the subspace selection and orthogonal dictionary learning of internal noisy PGs from given noisy images. The experiments on real image denoising problem have demonstrated the powerful ability of the proposed method. In the future, we will speed up the proposed algorithm and evaluate the




Figure 6. Denoised images of the 94-th cropped image from “Nikon D600 ISO 3200 C1” [14] by different methods. The images are better to be zoomed in on screen.

Table 2. Average PSNR(dB) results of different methods on 15 cropped real noisy images used in [14].

Camera Settings	Noisy	BM3D	WNNM	MLP	CSF	TRD	NI	NC	CC	Ours
Canon 5D Mark III ISO = 3200	37.00	37.08	37.09	33.92	35.68	36.20	37.68	<b>38.76</b>	38.37	<b>40.50</b>
	33.88	33.94	33.93	33.24	34.03	34.35	34.87	<b>35.69</b>	35.37	<b>37.05</b>
	33.83	33.88	33.90	32.37	32.63	33.10	34.77	<b>35.54</b>	34.91	<b>36.11</b>
Nikon D600 ISO = 3200	33.28	33.33	33.34	31.93	31.78	32.28	34.12	<b>35.57</b>	<b>34.98</b>	34.88
	33.77	33.85	33.79	34.15	35.16	35.34	35.36	<b>36.70</b>	35.95	<b>36.31</b>
	34.93	35.02	34.95	37.89	39.98	<b>40.51</b>	38.68	39.28	<b>41.15</b>	39.23
Nikon D800 ISO = 1600	35.47	35.54	35.57	33.77	34.84	35.09	37.34	<b>38.01</b>	37.99	<b>38.40</b>
	35.71	35.79	35.77	35.89	38.42	38.65	38.57	39.05	<b>40.36</b>	<b>40.92</b>
	34.81	34.92	34.95	34.25	35.79	35.85	37.87	38.20	<b>38.30</b>	<b>38.97</b>
Nikon D800 ISO = 3200	33.26	33.34	33.31	37.42	38.36	38.56	36.95	38.07	<b>39.01</b>	<b>38.66</b>
	32.89	32.95	32.96	34.88	35.53	35.76	35.09	35.72	<b>36.75</b>	<b>37.07</b>
	32.91	32.98	32.96	38.54	<b>40.05</b>	<b>40.59</b>	36.91	36.76	39.06	38.52
Nikon D800 ISO = 6400	29.63	29.66	29.71	33.59	34.08	<b>34.25</b>	31.28	33.49	<b>34.61</b>	33.76
	29.97	30.01	29.98	31.55	32.13	32.38	31.38	32.79	<b>33.21</b>	<b>33.43</b>
	29.87	29.90	29.95	31.42	31.52	31.76	31.40	32.86	<b>33.22</b>	<b>33.58</b>
Average	33.41	33.48	33.48	34.32	35.33	35.65	35.49	36.43	<b>36.88</b>	<b>37.16</b>

Table 3. Average PSNR(dB) results of different methods on 60 real noisy images cropped from [14].

Methods	BM3D	WNNM	MLP	CSF
PSNR	34.58	34.52	36.19	37.40
Methods	TRD	NI	NC	Ours
PSNR	<b>37.75</b>	36.53	37.57	<b>38.75</b>

proposed method on other computer vision tasks such as image super-resolution.




Figure 7. Denoised images of the image “Canon 5D Mark 3 ISO 3200 1” by different methods. The images are better to be zoomed in on screen.

972

## References

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

- [1] M. Elad and M. Aharon. Image denoising via sparse and redundant representations over learned dictionaries. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 15(12):3736–3745, 2006. [1](#), [2](#)
- [2] J. Mairal, F. Bach, J. Ponce, G. Sapiro, and A. Zisserman. Non-local sparse models for image restoration. *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2272–2279, 2009. [1](#)
- [3] W. Dong, L. Zhang, G. Shi, and X. Li. Nonlocally centralized sparse representation for image restoration. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 22(4):1620–1630, 2013. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#)
- [4] A. Buades, B. Coll, and J. M. Morel. A non-local algorithm for image denoising. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 60–65, 2005. [1](#)
- [5] K. Dabov, A. Foi, V. Katkovnik, and K. Egiazarian. Image denoising by sparse 3-D transform-domain collaborative filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 16(8):2080–2095, 2007. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [6] K. Dabov, A. Foi, V. Katkovnik, and K. Egiazarian. Color image denoising via sparse 3D collaborative filtering with grouping constraint in luminance-chrominance space. *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 313–316, 2007. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [7] J. Xu, L. Zhang, W. Zuo, D. Zhang, and X. Feng. Patch group based nonlocal self-similarity prior learning for image denoising. *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 244–252, 2015. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [8] S. Gu, L. Zhang, W. Zuo, and X. Feng. Weighted nuclear norm minimization with application to image denoising. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2862–2869, 2014. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [9] H. C. Burger, C. J. Schuler, and S. Harmeling. Image denoising: Can plain neural networks compete with BM3D? *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2392–2399, 2012. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [10] U. Schmidt and S. Roth. Shrinkage fields for effective image restoration. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2774–2781, June 2014. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [11] Y. Chen, W. Yu, and T. Pock. On learning optimized reaction diffusion processes for effective image restoration. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5261–5269, 2015. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [12] S. Roth and M. J. Black. Fields of experts. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 82(2):205–229, 2009. [1](#), [2](#)
- [13] D. Zoran and Y. Weiss. From learning models of natural image patches to whole image restoration. *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 479–486, 2011. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)

- [14] S. Nam, Y. Hwang, Y. Matsushita, and S. J. Kim. A holistic approach to cross-channel image noise modeling and its application to image denoising. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1683–1691, 2016. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#) [1026](#)
- [15] G. E Healey and R. Kondepudy. Radiometric CCD camera calibration and noise estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 16(3):267–276, 1994. [1](#) [1027](#)
- [16] C. Liu, R. Szeliski, S. Bing Kang, C. L. Zitnick, and W. T. Freeman. Automatic estimation and removal of noise from a single image. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 30(2):299–314, 2008. [1](#), [2](#) [1035](#)
- [17] Z. Gong, Z. Shen, and K.-C. Toh. Image restoration with mixed or unknown noises. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 12(2):458–487, 2014. [1](#), [2](#) [1040](#)
- [18] F. Zhu, G. Chen, and P.-A. Heng. From noise modeling to blind image denoising. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016. [1](#), [2](#) [1042](#)
- [19] M. Lebrun, M. Colom, and J.-M. Morel. Multiscale image blind denoising. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 24(10):3149–3161, 2015. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#) [1045](#)
- [20] M. Lebrun, M. Colom, and J. M. Morel. The noise clinic: a blind image denoising algorithm. <http://www.ipol.im/pub/art/2015/125/>. Accessed 01 28, 2015. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#) [1051](#)
- [21] Neatlab ABSoft. Neat Image. <https://ni.neatvideo.com/home>. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#) [1053](#)
- [22] G. Yu, G. Sapiro, and S. Mallat. Solving inverse problems with piecewise linear estimators: From Gaussian mixture models to structured sparsity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 21(5):2481–2499, 2012. [2](#) [1055](#)
- [23] M. Zontak and M. Irani. Internal statistics of a single natural image. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 977–984, 2011. [2](#) [1059](#)
- [24] M. Lebrun, A. Buades, and J. M. Morel. A nonlocal Bayesian image denoising algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 6(3):1665–1688, 2013. [2](#) [1064](#)
- [25] D. L. Donoho and X. Huo. Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(7):2845–2862, 2001. [4](#) [1065](#)
- [26] H. Zou, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(2):265–286, 2006. [4](#) [1069](#)
- [27] X. Liu, M. Tanaka, and M. Okutomi. Single-image noise level estimation for blind denoising. *IEEE transactions on Image Processing*, 22(12):5226–5237, 2013. [6](#) [1073](#)