
When Super-Resolution Meets Camouflaged Object Detection: A Comparison Study

Juan Wen^{1,2}, Shupeng Cheng³, Peng Xu³, Bowen Zhou³, Radu Timofte^{2,4}
Weiyan Hou^{2*}, Luc Van Gool²

¹Zhengzhou University

²Computer Vision Lab, ETH Zurich

³Tsinghua University

⁴University of Wurzburg

{juawen,timofte,vangool}@vision.ee.ethz.ch , houwy@zzu.edu.cn
{peng_xu,zhou Bowen}@tsinghua.edu.cn , chengsp20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Super Resolution (SR) and Camouflaged Object Detection (COD) are two hot topics in computer vision with various joint applications. For instance, low-resolution surveillance images can be successively processed by super-resolution techniques and camouflaged object detection. However, in previous work, these two areas are always studied in isolation. In this paper, we, for the first time, conduct an integrated comparative evaluation for both. Specifically, we benchmark different super-resolution methods on commonly used COD datasets, and meanwhile, we evaluate the robustness of different COD models by using COD data processed by SR methods. Our goal is to bridge these two domains, discover novel experimental phenomena, summarize new experimental regularities, and provide insights and inspiration for future research work in both communities.

1 Introduction

Super-resolution(SR) is a technique employed to reconstruct visually pleasing, high-quality images from blurry, noisy, or low-resolution inputs Zhang et al. [2021]. Camouflaged Object Detection (COD) encompasses the challenging task of accurately detecting and localizing camouflaged objects within images captured in diverse natural and artificial environments. As two prominent research directions, SR and COD share numerous joint application scenarios, including critical areas such as security surveillance and reconnaissance, remote sensing image analysis, as well as advanced medical image processing analysis and autonomous cars.

However, in previous work, those two areas were always studied in isolation. In this paper, we present an integrated comparative evaluation of both, which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first of its kind. Specifically, on the one hand, we evaluate the performance of five super-resolution methods on four commonly used datasets in the camouflaged object detection domain. On the other hand, we evaluate the performance of nine COD models by feeding them with COD datasets processed by five different SR methods, which allows us to assess both the robustness of the COD models and view the performance of the SR methods from a novel perspective.

In our experiments, we observed variations in the performance of the five SR methods on the COD datasets compared to their performance on traditional SR datasets. Besides, we found that when COD datasets undergo downsampling and super-resolution processing, DGNNet Ji et al.

*Corresponding authors.

[2023]exhibits the best overall performance among the nine models. Further experimental details and observations will be discussed in Section 3 and 4.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We innovatively integrate the fields of super-resolution (SR) and camouflage object detection (COD).
- We conduct comprehensive experiments using five different super-resolution methods and nine COD models, enabling a quantitative evaluation of the robustness of various COD models and a novel perspective on evaluating different SR methods.
- We analyze the experimental data and summarize some experimental regularities, providing insights and directions for future research in both the fields of super-resolution and camouflage object detection.

2 Related work

2.1 Super-Resolution

Super Resolution (SR) is an image processing technique aimed at enhancing low-resolution images to high-resolution levels. One commonly used method to achieve this goal is bicubic SR, which utilizes bicubic Keys [1981] interpolation to increase image details and clarity. Bicubic Keys [1981]SR has been widely applied in traditional image processing. With the advancement of modern deep learning techniques, advanced super-resolution technologies have emerged. Enhanced Deep Super-Resolution EDSR Lim et al. [2017], is one such super-resolution method that leverages deep learning and is based on the concept of residual networks. Compared to traditional interpolation techniques, EDSR Lim et al. [2017] exhibits outstanding performance in enhancing image details and textures. ESRGAN Wang et al. [2018] is a deep supervised learning method for super-resolution based on generator and discriminator networks. Adversarial training between the generator and discriminator networks encourages the generator network to acquire better super-resolution reconstruction capabilities, resulting in results that are closer to real high-resolution images. It outperforms traditional methods and other deep learning-based super-resolution methods. SwinIR Liang et al. [2021], a novel image restoration technique, is based on the Swin Transformer model developed by Liu Liu et al. [2021]. SwinIR utilizes attention mechanisms for various tasks, including image and language processing. By leveraging Swin Transformer’s ability to model remote contextual information and global correlations, SwinIR improves the quality of image restoration. More recently, Cross Aggregation Transformer (CAT) Chen et al. [2022b] and Attention Shrinkage-based Precise Image Restoration Technique (ART) Zhang et al. [2022] have demonstrated state-of-the-art performance in various image restoration tasks, such as image super-resolution, denoising, and removal of JPEG compression artifacts. These techniques are based on transformer-based image restoration technology, which offers superior performance compared to existing convolutional neural network-based methods due to its parameter-independent global interactions.

2.2 Camouflaged Object Detection

In recent years, camouflage object detection has garnered increasing attention in the field of computer vision. Early COD methods relied on hand-crafted features, including color, texture, motion and gradient Mondal [2020]. However, due to the limited expressive power of hand-crafted features, these methods often fail to achieve satisfactory results in complex scenes. With the emergence of deep learning, many CNN-based models have shown promising performance in camouflaged object detection (COD). Fan *et.al.* Fan et al. [2020] utilized a multi-stage strategy, proposing first to locate and then detect camouflage objects for better performance. Yan *et.al.* Yan et al. [2021] introduced MirrorNet that utilizes both instance segmentation and adversarial attack techniques for effective detection. Sun *et.al.* Sun et al. [2021] presented C2FNet, incorporating an attention-induced cross-level fusion module and a dual-branch global context module to aggregate features from multiple levels and enhance feature representation. Inspired by the detection process of predators, Mei *et.al.* Mei et al. [2021] proposed PFNet, which includes a positioning module and a focus module to effectively detect camouflaged objects. Zhuge *et.al.* Zhuge et al. [2022] designed CubeNet, which combines attention fusion and X-shaped connections to aggregate multi-scale features. Zhai *et.al.* Zhai et al. [2021] developed a mutual graph learning model that separates one input into different

features to roughly locate the object and accurately identifying its boundary. Furthermore, Ji *et.al.* Ji et al. [2023] introduced DGNNet, which excavates texture information by learning object-level gradient instead of relying on boundary-aware or uncertainty-aware modeling.

3 Experiment

3.1 Hardware Information

We conducted all evaluation tasks on a NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU with 24GB of memory.

3.2 Dataset

In this experiment, we selected four widely used datasets in the field of camouflage object detection (COD): CHAMELEON Fan et al. [2021a], CAMO Le et al. [2019], COD10K Fan et al. [2021a], and NCK4 Lv et al. [2021]. CHAMELEON consists of 76 images obtained through a Google search for "camouflaged animals" and is solely used for testing purposes. CAMO comprises 1250 images of camouflaged objects, with 1000 images for training and 250 images for testing. COD10K includes a collection of 10,000 images from multiple websites, covering 10 super-classes and 78 sub-classes. Among the 10,000 images, 5066 are camouflaged, with 3044 images dedicated to training and 2026 images for testing. NC4K is currently the largest dataset used to test COD models and consists of 4121 camouflaged images in natural and artificial scenes.

3.3 Metrics

The evaluation of the SR models adopts two widely used evaluation indicators: SSIM (Structural SIMilarity) and PSNR (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio) Hore and Ziou [2010].

The evaluation of the COD models adopts four commonly used metrics, *i.e.*, mean absolute error M , Perazzi et al. [2012], weighted F-measure F_{β}^w , Margolin et al. [2014], structure-measure S_{α} , Fan et al. [2017] and mean E-measure E_{ϕ} , Fan et al. [2021b].

Additionally, to quantitatively compare the extent of performance degradation among different COD models, we propose two new metrics: Avg_D and DM. Specifically, when the performance of the COD model decreases, the metrics S_{α} , E_{ϕ} , and F_{β}^w decrease, while the metric M increases. Therefore, we use the average percentage decrease of S_{α} , E_{ϕ} , and F_{β}^w as the metric Avg_D, and the percentage increase of M as the metric DM to serve as quantitative measures for evaluating the performance degradation of COD models.

3.4 Evaluation of Camouflaged Object Detection Models

We selected nine COD models, namely SINet Fan et al. [2020], SINet-v2 (Fan et al. [2021a]), DGNNet Ji et al. [2023], FAPNet [9] Zhou et al. [2022], C2FNet Sun et al. [2021], C2FNet-v2 Chen et al. [2022a], BGNet Sun et al. [2022], Camoformer Yin et al. [2022], and UR-COD Kajiura et al. [2021] for evaluation. During the experiment, we fed the images processed by different super-resolution methods into these nine COD models individually and compared their output results with the ground truth (GT). The images that underwent downsampling and subsequent super-resolution modeling would lose some information compared to the original images. Consequently, inputting these images into COD models might lead to a decline in the performance of camouflage object detection. One of the aims of our experiment is to compare the extent of performance degradation among different COD models under this circumstance. This serves as a novel perspective to evaluate the robustness of COD models.

3.5 Evaluation of Super-Resolution Techniques

Initially, we evaluated different SR methods on the four COD datasets mentioned above. Specifically, we utilized the BICUBIC Keys [1981] 4x down-sampling method in Matlab to obtain low-quality images. Then, we applied five different 4x SR methods, namely EDSR Lim et al. [2017] ESRGAN Wang et al. [2018], SwinIR Liang et al. [2021], ART Zhang et al. [2022], and CAT Chen et al. [2022b]

to the low-quality images and compared the output images with the ground truth (GT) using the SSIM (Structural Similarity) and PSNR (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio) Hore and Ziou [2010] metrics. Furthermore, the aforementioned experiments of subjecting the datasets to downsampling, SR methods, and COD models in sequence provide a novel perspective for evaluating the performance of SR methods.

4 Results and analysis

4.1 Results and Analysis on the Evaluation of Different Super-Resolution Methods

After applying five SR methods to four common COD datasets:

- We found that the CAT Chen et al. [2022b] (Cross Aggregation Transformer) model achieved the best performance among the five SR methods, as it is currently the state-of-the-art method. This indicates that the CAT Chen et al. [2022b] model utilizes Rectangle-Window Self-Attention (Rwin-SA) to expand the attention area and aggregate features across different windows using horizontal and vertical rectangular window attention with different heads. It incorporates Axial-Shift operation for interactions between different windows. The Locality Complementary Module is used to complement the self-attention mechanism, combining the inductive biases of CNN (such as translation invariance and locality) into the Transformer, thus achieving global-local coupling in this image restoration model, which exhibits good generalization performance in real-world scenarios. However, in our experiments, we found that the CAT Chen et al. [2022b] model has a deep, large, and complex network structure, requiring more resources, time, and expertise for training and testing.
- The ART Zhang et al. [2022] model is the second most advanced method among the five SR methods, and it also performs well, achieving a sub-optimal performance on the four common COD datasets.
- EDSR Lim et al. [2017] is the champion of the NTIRE 2017 SR Agustsson and Timofte [2017] challenge. It is based on SRResNet Ledig et al. [2017] but enhances the network by removing normalization layers and using a deeper and wider network structure. The EDSR Lim et al. [2017] model demonstrates excellent performance in terms of Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) and Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) on the four common COD datasets. It even surpasses SwinIR Liang et al. [2021] and ESRGAN Wang et al. [2018], indicating good real-world generalization performance of the EDSR Lim et al. [2017] method.
- In the four COD datasets, when testing with models trained using SwinIR Liang et al. [2021] and EDSR Lim et al. [2017], we observed that SwinIR achieved lower SSIM (Structural SIMilarity) and PSNR (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio) Hore and Ziou [2010] results compared to EDSR Lim et al. [2017]. The potential reasons for this are as follows:

Differences in training datasets: SwinIR and EDSR Lim et al. [2017] use different training datasets. The diversity and representativeness of the training dataset are crucial for obtaining good results on real-world test images. If SwinIR's Liang et al. [2021] training dataset does not match the features and content of the test images, it may lead to degraded performance.

Selection of model architecture and parameters: SwinIR Liang et al. [2021] and EDSR Lim et al. [2017] have different network architectures and parameter settings. On the same real-world image dataset, SwinIR's Liang et al. [2021] model architecture and parameter settings may not be as suitable, resulting in lower performance compared to EDSR Lim et al. [2017]. The choice of model architecture and parameters can be critical for achieving better results on specific datasets.

Training process and strategies: SwinIR Liang et al. [2021] and EDSR Lim et al. [2017] also differ in their training process and strategies. Different training strategies can lead to different model performances on real-world images. Factors such as data augmentation, choice of loss functions, and hyperparameters during training can all influence the model's performance.

Image content and characteristics: The content and characteristics of real-world image datasets can also impact the results of super-resolution methods. Some images may be better suited for EDSR's Lim et al. [2017] approach in capturing details and textures, while others may be more suitable for SwinIR's Liang et al. [2021] approach. Therefore, different characteristics of different images may lead to lower performance of SwinIR Liang et al. [2021] on certain images. Overall, this suggests that SwinIR has a slightly weaker generalization performance than EDSR Lim et al. [2017] in real-world scenarios.

Table 1: Results of PSNR and SSIM test metrics for five SR methods on four COD test datasets

Method	Scale	CAMO		COD10K		NC4K		CHAMELEON	
		PSNR \uparrow	SSIM \uparrow						
EDSR	X4	22.54	0.5738	24.93	0.6670	24.13	0.6354	22.02	0.5416
ESRGAN	X4	21.12	0.5140	23.48	0.6147	22.76	0.5843	20.72	0.4856
SwinIR (classical-SR)	X4	22.46	0.5700	24.85	0.6637	24.05	0.6321	21.95	0.5393
ART	X4	24.40	0.6161	26.96	0.7110	26.15	0.6808	23.80	0.5783
CAT	X4	24.45	0.6180	27.00	0.7126	26.18	0.6823	23.83	0.5796

- ESRGAN performed the worst in terms of SSIM (Structural SIMilarity) and PSNR (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio) Hore and Ziou [2010] among the five SR methods tested on the four common COD datasets. However, it should be noted that ESRGAN is a GAN-based method introduced in ECCV 2018 Wang et al. [2018], and its design primarily focuses on generating high-quality images rather than optimizing for PSNR.

4.2 Results and Analysis on the Evaluation of Different Camouflaged Object Detection Models

We quantitatively evaluated the performance degradation of nine COD models when presented with datasets processed by five different SR methods using the two new metrics mentioned earlier. The results are depicted in Figures 1 to 8.




Figure 1: scatter plot of Avg_D on CAMO

Our observations are as follows:

- Overall, considering the input data that undergoes downsampling followed by super-resolution, DGNet Ji et al. [2023] exhibits the least amount of performance degradation. This may be attributed to DGNet’s Ji et al. [2023] ability to detect texture patterns while suppressing the noise from irrelevant background by an intensity-sensitive strategy focusing on the gradient inside the camouflaged object. More specifically, DGnet Ji et al. [2023] consists of two connected learning branches, i.e., context encoder and texture encoder. The former extracts high-level features from images by picking out the top-three features from the widely used EfficientNet Tan and Le [2019]. The latter is a structural texture extractor supervised by the object-level gradient map. This map holds both the gradient cues of the object’s boundaries and interior regions while neglecting irrelevant background noises. When image quality deteriorates, the increase in




Figure 2: scatter plot of Avg_D on COD10K




Figure 3: scatter plot of Avg_D on NC4K

irrelevant environmental noise can significantly impact the performance of COD models. We speculate that DGNet’s Ji et al. [2023] design for suppressing background noise allows it to outperform other COD models in this experiment. Its robustness makes it a promising architecture for further exploration of its potential abilities.

- We found that BGNet Sun et al. [2022] struggled in the experiment, while UR-COD Kajiura et al. [2021], which also emphasizes edge detection, exhibited better performance than BGNet Sun et al. [2022]. Based on our analysis, this is likely because the UR-COD model Kajiura et al. [2021] uses an uncertainty-aware map refinement module (UAMR) to absorb uncertainty. More specifically, the UR-COD model Kajiura et al. [2021] firstly takes the input image to both a pseudo-edge generator and a conventional COD model (in our work, we use SINet-v2 Fan et al. [2021a]). The former explicitly estimates the boundaries of camouflaged objects and produces a pseudo-edge label, while the latter generates a camouflaged object detection result, which is treated as a pseudo-map label. However, these pseudo labels are generated by learning-based models, thus containing uncertainty. So UR-COD Kajiura et al. [2021] extended UCNet Zhang et al. [2020] and designed a UAMR module to reduce uncertainty and noise. In this experiment, in




Figure 4: scatter plot of Avg_D on CHAMELEON




Figure 5: scatter plot of DM on CAMO

addition to the uncertainty introduced by pseudo labels, the input image itself contains noise and uncertainty after being processed through downsampling and SR models. So we speculate that this module that mitigates noise and uncertainty played a pivotal role in the superior performance of UR-COD Kajiura et al. [2021] compared to BGNet Sun et al. [2022]. In future research, if the input images contain noise, we believe that the approach employed by UR-COD Kajiura et al. [2021] is worth considering and adopting as a reference.

- Despite its less notable performance on the DM metric, CamoFormer Yin et al. [2022] exhibits commendable results on the Avg_D metric, ranking just below DGNet Ji et al. [2023]. Since CamoFormer Yin et al. [2022] is a transformer-based model, this result could potentially be attributed to the long-range modelling capabilities of the Transformer architecture. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that among these nine models, CamoFormer Yin et al. [2022] demonstrates the best performance when other conditions are held constant. This implies that CamoFormer Yin et al. [2022] exhibits commendable robustness while maintaining high performance. Therefore, we believe that the Transformer architecture will remain a popular research direction in the COD field for the foreseeable future.




Figure 6: scatter plot of DM on COD10K




Figure 7: scatter plot of DM on NC4K

4.3 Summary

From Figure 1 to Figure 8, it can be observed that the ART method achieved the best results in terms of Avg_D among the four COD datasets processed using five SR methods and subsequently by nine COD models. In terms of DM, the CAT method yielded the best results. These findings are consistent with the ranking of the performance indicators for the five SR methods across the four COD datasets. Notably, both of the top-performing SR methods employed transformer models, as did the CamoFormer model, which demonstrated the best performance among the nine COD models. These results suggest that the transformer model has become the de facto choice in natural language processing, while also exhibiting strong generalization and robustness in the fields of SR and COD. Therefore, the transformer model is likely to remain a popular research direction in the domains of SR and COD for the next few years.




Figure 8: scatter plot of DM on CHAMELEON

5 Discussion and Prospects

- Disguised targets often blur the edges and details, making them harder to detect in low-resolution images. By utilizing SR processing, we can partially restore the edge and detail information of the target, providing clearer visual cues that can help detection models more accurately locate and identify the disguised targets.
- The transformer model exhibits strong generalization and robustness in both the SR and COD domains. This suggests that the transformer model is likely to remain a popular research direction in the SR and COD fields in the coming years.

Our work has two main limitations:

- **Firstly**, the selection of COD and SR models may not be comprehensive enough, as the experiments conducted did not encompass all possible models. **Secondly**, the metric proposed for assessing the degradation in performance of the COD model may not be optimal or scientifically rigorous.
- **In the future**, our plan entails exploring and developing superior SR and COD models by means of evaluating performance indicators. Additionally, we aim to investigate and refine assessment metrics to ensure a more comprehensive and accurate evaluation of model performance.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a novel comparative study on SR and COD. **Initially**, we analyze and compare the performance differences of various SR models on the COD datasets. **Subsequently**, we quantitatively measure the degree of performance degradation of different COD models on datasets processed by different SR methods. This provides a new perspective for evaluating SR methods and COD performance, respectively. **Finally**, we summarize the observed patterns in the experiments and discuss the limitations of our work. We hope that this article will provide new ideas and insights for researchers in both communities in the future.

References

- Eirikur Agustsson and Radu Timofte. Ntire 2017 challenge on single image super-resolution: Dataset and study. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 126–135, 2017.
- Geng Chen, Si-Jie Liu, Yu-Jia Sun, Ge-Peng Ji, Ya-Feng Wu, and Tao Zhou. Camouflaged object detection via context-aware cross-level fusion. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(10): 6981–6993, 2022a.

- Zheng Chen, Yulun Zhang, Jinjin Gu, Linghe Kong, Xin Yuan, et al. Cross aggregation transformer for image restoration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25478–25490, 2022b.
- Deng-Ping Fan, Ming-Ming Cheng, Yun Liu, Tao Li, and Ali Borji. Structure-measure: A new way to evaluate foreground maps. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 4548–4557, 2017.
- Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Guolei Sun, Ming-Ming Cheng, Jianbing Shen, and Ling Shao. Camouflaged object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2777–2787, 2020.
- Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Ling Shao. Concealed object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(10):6024–6042, 2021a.
- Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Xuebin Qin, and Ming-Ming Cheng. Cognitive vision inspired object segmentation metric and loss function. *Scientia Sinica Informationis*, 6(6), 2021b.
- Alain Hore and Djemel Ziou. Image quality metrics: Psnr vs. ssim. In *2010 20th international conference on pattern recognition*, pages 2366–2369. IEEE, 2010.
- Ge-Peng Ji, Deng-Ping Fan, Yu-Cheng Chou, Dengxin Dai, Alexander Liniger, and Luc Van Gool. Deep gradient learning for efficient camouflaged object detection. *Machine Intelligence Research*, 20(1):92–108, 2023.
- Nobukatsu Kajiura, Hong Liu, and Shin’ichi Satoh. Improving camouflaged object detection with the uncertainty of pseudo-edge labels. In *ACM Multimedia Asia*, pages 1–7. 2021.
- Robert Keys. Cubic convolution interpolation for digital image processing. *IEEE transactions on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, 29(6):1153–1160, 1981.
- Trung-Nghia Le, Tam V Nguyen, Zhongliang Nie, Minh-Triet Tran, and Akihiro Sugimoto. Anabranh network for camouflaged object segmentation. *Computer vision and image understanding*, 184:45–56, 2019.
- Christian Ledig, Lucas Theis, Ferenc Huszár, Jose Caballero, Andrew Cunningham, Alejandro Acosta, Andrew Aitken, Alykhan Tejani, Johannes Totz, Zehan Wang, et al. Photo-realistic single image super-resolution using a generative adversarial network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4681–4690, 2017.
- Jingyun Liang, Jiezhong Cao, Guolei Sun, Kai Zhang, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Swinir: Image restoration using swin transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1833–1844, 2021.
- Bee Lim, Sanghyun Son, Heewon Kim, Seungjun Nah, and Kyoung Mu Lee. Enhanced deep residual networks for single image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 136–144, 2017.
- Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- Yunqiu Lv, Jing Zhang, Yuchao Dai, Aixuan Li, Bowen Liu, Nick Barnes, and Deng-Ping Fan. Simultaneously localize, segment and rank the camouflaged objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11591–11601, 2021.
- Ran Margolin, Lihi Zelnik-Manor, and Ayellet Tal. How to evaluate foreground maps? In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255, 2014.
- Haiyang Mei, Ge-Peng Ji, Ziqi Wei, Xin Yang, Xiaopeng Wei, and Deng-Ping Fan. Camouflaged object segmentation with distraction mining. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8772–8781, 2021.
- Ajoy Mondal. Camouflaged object detection and tracking: A survey. *International Journal of Image and Graphics*, 20(04):2050028, 2020.
- Federico Perazzi, Philipp Krähenbühl, Yael Pritch, and Alexander Hornung. Saliency filters: Contrast based filtering for salient region detection. In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 733–740. IEEE, 2012.
- Yujia Sun, Geng Chen, Tao Zhou, Yi Zhang, and Nian Liu. Context-aware cross-level fusion network for camouflaged object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.12555*, 2021.

- Yujia Sun, Shuo Wang, Chenglizhao Chen, and Tian-Zhu Xiang. Boundary-guided camouflaged object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00794*, 2022.
- Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6105–6114. PMLR, 2019.
- Xintao Wang, Ke Yu, Shixiang Wu, Jinjin Gu, Yihao Liu, Chao Dong, Yu Qiao, and Chen Change Loy. Esrgan: Enhanced super-resolution generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV) workshops*, pages 0–0, 2018.
- Jinnan Yan, Trung-Nghia Le, Khanh-Duy Nguyen, Minh-Triet Tran, Thanh-Toan Do, and Tam V Nguyen. Mirrornet: Bio-inspired camouflaged object segmentation. *IEEE Access*, 9:43290–43300, 2021.
- Bowen Yin, Xuying Zhang, Qibin Hou, Bo-Yuan Sun, Deng-Ping Fan, and Luc Van Gool. Camoformer: Masked separable attention for camouflaged object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06570*, 2022.
- Qiang Zhai, Xin Li, Fan Yang, Chenglizhao Chen, Hong Cheng, and Deng-Ping Fan. Mutual graph learning for camouflaged object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12997–13007, 2021.
- Jiale Zhang, Yulun Zhang, Jinjin Gu, Yongbing Zhang, Linghe Kong, and Xin Yuan. Accurate image restoration with attention retractable transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01427*, 2022.
- Jing Zhang, Deng-Ping Fan, Yuchao Dai, Saeed Anwar, Fatemeh Sadat Saleh, Tong Zhang, and Nick Barnes. Uc-net: Uncertainty inspired rgb-d saliency detection via conditional variational autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8582–8591, 2020.
- Kai Zhang, Yawei Li, Wangmeng Zuo, Lei Zhang, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Plug-and-play image restoration with deep denoiser prior. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(10):6360–6376, 2021.
- Tao Zhou, Yi Zhou, Chen Gong, Jian Yang, and Yu Zhang. Feature aggregation and propagation network for camouflaged object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 31:7036–7047, 2022.
- Mingchen Zhuge, Xiankai Lu, Yiyu Guo, Zhihua Cai, and Shuhan Chen. Cubenet: X-shape connection for camouflaged object detection. *Pattern Recognition*, 127:108644, 2022.

Checklist

1. For all authors...
 - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? [Yes]
 - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes]
 - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [No] There are no potential negative societal impacts in this paper because we used synthetic graph generators.
 - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes]
2. If you are including theoretical results...
 - (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
 - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes]
 - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes]
 - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [Yes]
 - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes]
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
 - (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes]
 - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes]
 - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes]
 - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [N/A]
 - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [N/A]
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
 - (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
 - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]

Table 2: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are not preprocessed by any SR method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.812	0.870	0.749	0.073	0.901	0.943	0.850	0.027	0.831	0.901	0.722	0.033	0.851	0.907	0.788	0.044
UR-COD	0.814	0.891	0.758	0.067	0.901	0.960	0.862	0.023	0.816	0.903	0.708	0.033	0.844	0.910	0.787	0.045
C2FNet	0.796	0.854	0.719	0.080	0.886	0.933	0.825	0.033	0.813	0.890	0.686	0.036	0.838	0.897	0.762	0.049
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.799	0.859	0.730	0.077	0.893	0.947	0.845	0.028	0.811	0.887	0.691	0.036	0.840	0.896	0.770	0.048
CamoFormer	0.872	0.929	0.831	0.046	0.910	0.956	0.859	0.023	0.869	0.932	0.786	0.023	0.892	0.939	0.847	0.030
DGnet	0.839	0.901	0.769	0.057	0.890	0.938	0.816	0.029	0.822	0.896	0.693	0.033	0.857	0.911	0.784	0.042
FAPNet	0.815	0.865	0.734	0.076	0.893	0.940	0.825	0.028	0.822	0.888	0.694	0.036	0.851	0.899	0.775	0.047
SINet	0.745	0.804	0.644	0.092	0.872	0.936	0.806	0.034	0.776	0.864	0.631	0.043	0.808	0.871	0.723	0.058
SINet-v2	0.820	0.882	0.743	0.070	0.888	0.941	0.816	0.030	0.815	0.887	0.680	0.037	0.847	0.903	0.770	0.048

7 Appendix

Include extra information in the appendix. This section will often be part of the supplemental material. Please see the call on the NeurIPS website for links to additional guides on dataset publication.

1. Submission introducing new datasets must include the following in the supplementary materials:
 - (a) Dataset documentation and intended uses. Recommended documentation frameworks include datasheets for datasets, dataset nutrition labels, data statements for NLP, and accountability frameworks.
 - (b) URL to website/platform where the dataset/benchmark can be viewed and downloaded by the reviewers.
 - (c) Author statement that they bear all responsibility in case of violation of rights, etc., and confirmation of the data license.
 - (d) Hosting, licensing, and maintenance plan. The choice of hosting platform is yours, as long as you ensure access to the data (possibly through a curated interface) and will provide the necessary maintenance.
2. To ensure accessibility, the supplementary materials for datasets must include the following:
 - (a) Links to access the dataset and its metadata. This can be hidden upon submission if the dataset is not yet publicly available but must be added in the camera-ready version. In select cases, *e.g.* when the data can only be released at a later date, this can be added afterward. Simulation environments should link to (open source) code repositories.
 - (b) The dataset itself should ideally use an open and widely used data format. Provide a detailed explanation on how the dataset can be read. For simulation environments, use existing frameworks or explain how they can be used.
 - (c) Long-term preservation: It must be clear that the dataset will be available for a long time, either by uploading to a data repository or by explaining how the authors themselves will ensure this.
 - (d) Explicit license: Authors must choose a license, ideally a CC license for datasets, or an open source license for code (*e.g.* RL environments).
 - (e) Add structured metadata to a dataset’s meta-data page using Web standards (like schema.org and DCAT): This allows it to be discovered and organized by anyone. If you use an existing data repository, this is often done automatically.
 - (f) Highly recommended: a persistent dereferenceable identifier (*e.g.* a DOI minted by a data repository or a prefix on identifiers.org) for datasets, or a code repository (*e.g.* GitHub, GitLab,...) for code. If this is not possible or useful, please explain why.
3. For benchmarks, the supplementary materials must ensure that all results are easily reproducible. Where possible, use a reproducibility framework such as the ML reproducibility checklist, or otherwise guarantee that all results can be easily reproduced, *i.e.* all necessary datasets, code, and evaluation procedures must be accessible and documented.
4. For papers introducing best practices in creating or curating datasets and benchmarks, the above supplementary materials are not required.

Table 3: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are preprocessed by ART method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.655	0.734	0.499	0.152	0.717	0.783	0.559	0.107	0.705	0.787	0.507	0.073	0.715	0.786	0.567	0.106
UR-COD	0.693	0.777	0.573	0.131	0.778	0.855	0.665	0.073	0.723	0.811	0.547	0.065	0.741	0.818	0.619	0.090
C2FNet	0.660	0.717	0.503	0.130	0.748	0.817	0.605	0.080	0.701	0.782	0.500	0.069	0.726	0.796	0.586	0.092
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.652	0.720	0.492	0.136	0.733	0.805	0.589	0.087	0.696	0.774	0.496	0.076	0.719	0.789	0.577	0.098
CamoFormer	0.766	0.835	0.661	0.094	0.806	0.867	0.693	0.060	0.790	0.862	0.652	0.046	0.804	0.864	0.706	0.065
DGnet	0.738	0.799	0.607	0.101	0.821	0.891	0.697	0.051	0.763	0.839	0.589	0.050	0.786	0.850	0.667	0.069
FAPNet	0.704	0.761	0.551	0.130	0.793	0.847	0.644	0.071	0.732	0.789	0.527	0.070	0.753	0.805	0.603	0.092
SINet	0.640	0.682	0.463	0.130	0.752	0.816	0.612	0.072	0.708	0.796	0.513	0.061	0.724	0.794	0.586	0.088
SINet-v2	0.702	0.761	0.558	0.140	0.778	0.833	0.634	0.082	0.725	0.791	0.524	0.072	0.746	0.805	0.601	0.096

Table 4: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are preprocessed by EDSR method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.653	0.735	0.493	0.152	0.705	0.772	0.542	0.111	0.698	0.778	0.496	0.077	0.708	0.778	0.556	0.110
UR-COD	0.689	0.773	0.569	0.136	0.779	0.852	0.663	0.073	0.722	0.808	0.544	0.066	0.739	0.815	0.615	0.092
C2FNet	0.648	0.709	0.482	0.135	0.745	0.811	0.599	0.083	0.701	0.778	0.497	0.070	0.725	0.793	0.582	0.093
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.643	0.707	0.478	0.140	0.722	0.790	0.568	0.092	0.693	0.769	0.491	0.077	0.715	0.785	0.570	0.099
CamoFormer	0.760	0.830	0.655	0.099	0.809	0.875	0.697	0.057	0.788	0.859	0.649	0.047	0.803	0.862	0.704	0.066
DGnet	0.738	0.801	0.608	0.103	0.822	0.886	0.698	0.051	0.762	0.839	0.588	0.050	0.785	0.849	0.665	0.070
FAPNet	0.706	0.761	0.551	0.132	0.793	0.842	0.640	0.074	0.731	0.787	0.525	0.071	0.750	0.802	0.597	0.093
SINet	0.636	0.682	0.458	0.133	0.747	0.810	0.604	0.076	0.708	0.794	0.513	0.062	0.724	0.794	0.586	0.088
SINet-v2	0.698	0.756	0.552	0.146	0.778	0.831	0.632	0.083	0.723	0.789	0.522	0.072	0.744	0.801	0.597	0.099

Table 5: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are preprocessed by SWINIR method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.651	0.733	0.492	0.152	0.709	0.774	0.546	0.111	0.698	0.779	0.497	0.076	0.710	0.781	0.558	0.108
UR-COD	0.690	0.778	0.568	0.134	0.776	0.853	0.658	0.073	0.722	0.809	0.545	0.066	0.738	0.815	0.615	0.091
C2FNet	0.652	0.709	0.491	0.133	0.745	0.807	0.597	0.081	0.700	0.778	0.496	0.071	0.722	0.792	0.579	0.094
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.651	0.710	0.491	0.141	0.720	0.790	0.569	0.093	0.694	0.773	0.493	0.077	0.715	0.785	0.570	0.100
CamoFormer	0.761	0.832	0.657	0.098	0.806	0.867	0.693	0.060	0.788	0.861	0.648	0.046	0.802	0.861	0.702	0.067
DGnet	0.736	0.799	0.604	0.103	0.821	0.887	0.696	0.051	0.761	0.837	0.586	0.050	0.784	0.849	0.664	0.070
FAPNet	0.706	0.765	0.553	0.130	0.793	0.836	0.638	0.072	0.730	0.785	0.523	0.072	0.749	0.801	0.596	0.093
SINet	0.638	0.684	0.461	0.131	0.746	0.815	0.599	0.077	0.708	0.795	0.514	0.062	0.724	0.795	0.586	0.089
SINet-v2	0.698	0.760	0.552	0.144	0.775	0.831	0.627	0.083	0.723	0.789	0.522	0.072	0.744	0.802	0.597	0.098

Table 6: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are preprocessed by ESRGAN method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.634	0.708	0.464	0.143	0.713	0.790	0.556	0.090	0.689	0.780	0.483	0.073	0.694	0.776	0.538	0.100
UR-COD	0.660	0.763	0.528	0.138	0.780	0.865	0.660	0.067	0.718	0.814	0.537	0.063	0.721	0.805	0.589	0.093
C2FNet	0.635	0.684	0.461	0.135	0.754	0.831	0.619	0.072	0.700	0.783	0.495	0.066	0.711	0.784	0.563	0.093
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.626	0.692	0.456	0.142	0.733	0.814	0.590	0.082	0.689	0.774	0.485	0.072	0.696	0.773	0.543	0.099
CamoFormer	0.725	0.804	0.607	0.107	0.798	0.877	0.685	0.059	0.779	0.857	0.634	0.046	0.785	0.850	0.677	0.070
DGnet	0.725	0.791	0.591	0.109	0.818	0.877	0.695	0.052	0.758	0.837	0.581	0.051	0.778	0.846	0.655	0.072
FAPNet	0.679	0.733	0.509	0.136	0.783	0.836	0.628	0.077	0.723	0.785	0.513	0.072	0.732	0.789	0.572	0.097
SINet	0.622	0.670	0.437	0.134	0.728	0.795	0.577	0.079	0.700	0.787	0.500	0.063	0.710	0.784	0.567	0.090
SINet-v2	0.672	0.751	0.518	0.146	0.780	0.842	0.630	0.075	0.720	0.792	0.514	0.070	0.729	0.793	0.573	0.099

Table 7: **Quantitative comparison when datasets are preprocessed by CAT method.** The symbols \uparrow/\downarrow indicate that a higher/lower score is better.

Method	CAMO				CHAMELEON				COD10K				NC4K			
	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$	$S_\alpha \uparrow$	$E_\phi \uparrow$	$F_\beta^w \uparrow$	$M \downarrow$
BGnet	0.656	0.732	0.500	0.152	0.719	0.785	0.564	0.102	0.704	0.787	0.506	0.073	0.715	0.785	0.567	0.107
UR-COD	0.693	0.780	0.573	0.131	0.783	0.856	0.672	0.072	0.723	0.810	0.547	0.065	0.742	0.819	0.622	0.089
C2FNet	0.656	0.712	0.498	0.132	0.750	0.817	0.602	0.080	0.701	0.782	0.499	0.069	0.727	0.796	0.586	0.092
C2FNet-TSCVT	0.650	0.719	0.489	0.138	0.729	0.796	0.583	0.088	0.697	0.775	0.497	0.075	0.719	0.791	0.578	0.098
CamoFormer	0.764	0.833	0.660	0.096	0.809	0.870	0.696	0.059	0.791	0.863	0.653	0.045	0.805	0.865	0.708	0.065
DGnet	0.736	0.797	0.605	0.102	0.822	0.889	0.698	0.051	0.763	0.839	0.588	0.050	0.786	0.850	0.667	0.069
FAPNet	0.711	0.771	0.561	0.127	0.800	0.850	0.656	0.069	0.732	0.789	0.528	0.070	0.754	0.806	0.605	0.091
SINet	0.643	0.696	0.471	0.129	0.756	0.816	0.621	0.071	0.708	0.796	0.514	0.061	0.726	0.796	0.590	0.087
SINet-v2	0.702	0.764	0.558	0.141	0.781	0.835	0.641	0.080	0.725	0.791	0.525	0.072	0.748	0.806	0.604	0.096

Table 8: COD-SR-BGNet

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	BGNet	0.812	0.749	0.073	0.876	0.870	0.882	0.786	0.789	0.799
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.901	0.85	0.027	0.938	0.943	0.954	0.846	0.86	0.882
	COD10K	BGNet	0.831	0.722	0.033	0.902	0.901	0.911	0.739	0.753	0.774
	NC4K	BGNet	0.851	0.788	0.044	0.911	0.907	0.916	0.813	0.820	0.833
ART	CAMO	BGNet	0.655	0.499	0.152	0.755	0.734	0.746	0.567	0.56	0.567
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.717	0.559	0.107	0.803	0.783	0.805	0.612	0.605	0.616
	COD10K	BGNet	0.705	0.507	0.073	0.786	0.787	0.801	0.548	0.554	0.574
	NC4K	BGNet	0.715	0.567	0.106	0.793	0.786	0.798	0.617	0.619	0.638
EDSR	CAMO	BGNet	0.653	0.493	0.152	0.755	0.735	0.747	0.559	0.551	0.558
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.705	0.542	0.111	0.788	0.772	0.786	0.578	0.586	0.597
	COD10K	BGNet	0.698	0.496	0.077	0.777	0.778	0.792	0.536	0.542	0.563
	NC4K	BGNet	0.708	0.556	0.11	0.786	0.778	0.792	0.607	0.607	0.627
SWINIR	CAMO	BGNet	0.651	0.492	0.152	0.758	0.733	0.745	0.564	0.549	0.555
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.709	0.546	0.111	0.794	0.774	0.794	0.594	0.594	0.603
	COD10K	BGNet	0.698	0.497	0.076	0.779	0.779	0.794	0.538	0.544	0.566
	NC4K	BGNet	0.71	0.558	0.108	0.788	0.781	0.793	0.61	0.61	0.627
ESRGAN	CAMO	BGNet	0.634	0.464	0.143	0.735	0.708	0.722	0.546	0.529	0.536
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.713	0.556	0.09	0.806	0.79	0.802	0.621	0.612	0.619
	COD10K	BGNet	0.689	0.483	0.073	0.784	0.78	0.789	0.53	0.534	0.55
	NC4K	BGNet	0.694	0.538	0.1	0.792	0.776	0.785	0.603	0.597	0.604
CAT	CAMO	BGNet	0.656	0.5	0.152	0.751	0.732	0.743	0.563	0.558	0.566
	CHAMELEON	BGNet	0.719	0.564	0.102	0.804	0.785	0.802	0.605	0.609	0.62
	COD10K	BGNet	0.704	0.506	0.073	0.785	0.787	0.8	0.547	0.553	0.574
	NC4K	BGNet	0.715	0.567	0.107	0.792	0.785	0.799	0.617	0.618	0.638

Table 9: COD-SR-UR-SINetv2

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.814	0.758	0.067	0.894	0.891	0.895	0.796	0.795	0.802
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.901	0.862	0.023	0.962	0.96	0.965	0.872	0.873	0.883
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.816	0.708	0.033	0.901	0.903	0.907	0.731	0.742	0.756
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.844	0.787	0.045	0.914	0.91	0.915	0.817	0.819	0.826
ART	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.693	0.573	0.131	0.784	0.777	0.79	0.629	0.623	0.633
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.778	0.665	0.073	0.853	0.855	0.87	0.701	0.703	0.718
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.723	0.547	0.065	0.807	0.811	0.821	0.583	0.59	0.605
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.741	0.619	0.09	0.821	0.818	0.824	0.663	0.665	0.675
EDSR	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.689	0.569	0.136	0.781	0.773	0.785	0.626	0.62	0.628
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.779	0.663	0.073	0.856	0.852	0.859	0.701	0.7	0.71
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.722	0.544	0.066	0.805	0.808	0.819	0.58	0.588	0.605
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.739	0.615	0.092	0.817	0.815	0.822	0.659	0.66	0.671
SWINIR	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.69	0.568	0.134	0.784	0.778	0.795	0.625	0.619	0.632
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.776	0.658	0.073	0.849	0.853	0.87	0.692	0.695	0.711
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.722	0.545	0.066	0.804	0.809	0.819	0.58	0.588	0.605
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.738	0.615	0.091	0.818	0.815	0.822	0.659	0.66	0.671
ESRGAN	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.66	0.528	0.138	0.78	0.763	0.768	0.594	0.584	0.588
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.78	0.66	0.067	0.864	0.865	0.876	0.699	0.7	0.711
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.718	0.537	0.063	0.809	0.814	0.824	0.575	0.583	0.597
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.721	0.589	0.093	0.811	0.805	0.809	0.641	0.64	0.646
CAT	CAMO	UR-SINetv2	0.693	0.573	0.131	0.788	0.78	0.793	0.629	0.623	0.633
	CHAMELEON	UR-SINetv2	0.783	0.672	0.072	0.855	0.856	0.868	0.706	0.708	0.722
	COD10K	UR-SINetv2	0.723	0.547	0.065	0.807	0.81	0.82	0.583	0.591	0.607
	NC4K	UR-SINetv2	0.742	0.622	0.089	0.822	0.819	0.825	0.666	0.667	0.677

Table 10: COD-SR-C2FNet

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	C2FNet	0.796	0.719	0.080	0.865	0.854	0.864	0.764	0.762	0.771
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.886	0.825	0.033	0.93	0.933	0.944	0.833	0.841	0.86
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.813	0.686	0.036	0.886	0.890	0.900	0.703	0.723	0.743
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.838	0.762	0.049	0.901	0.897	0.904	0.788	0.795	0.810
ART	CAMO	C2FNet	0.66	0.503	0.13	0.758	0.717	0.734	0.585	0.562	0.575
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.748	0.605	0.08	0.839	0.817	0.832	0.658	0.651	0.66
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.701	0.5	0.069	0.787	0.782	0.789	0.544	0.548	0.56
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.726	0.586	0.092	0.81	0.796	0.803	0.643	0.639	0.646
EDSR	CAMO	C2FNet	0.648	0.482	0.135	0.746	0.709	0.721	0.563	0.537	0.549
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.745	0.599	0.083	0.83	0.811	0.82	0.645	0.644	0.659
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.701	0.497	0.07	0.783	0.778	0.785	0.539	0.545	0.559
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.725	0.582	0.093	0.809	0.793	0.8	0.64	0.636	0.643
SWINIR	CAMO	C2FNet	0.652	0.491	0.133	0.749	0.709	0.726	0.574	0.549	0.564
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.745	0.597	0.081	0.827	0.807	0.814	0.648	0.641	0.653
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.7	0.496	0.071	0.783	0.778	0.786	0.539	0.544	0.557
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.722	0.579	0.094	0.807	0.792	0.799	0.637	0.633	0.64
ESRGAN	CAMO	C2FNet	0.635	0.461	0.135	0.737	0.684	0.718	0.551	0.522	0.531
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.754	0.619	0.072	0.857	0.831	0.855	0.677	0.667	0.675
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.7	0.495	0.066	0.788	0.783	0.791	0.541	0.546	0.557
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.711	0.563	0.093	0.803	0.784	0.794	0.626	0.62	0.626
CAT	CAMO	C2FNet	0.656	0.498	0.132	0.757	0.712	0.738	0.582	0.557	0.57
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet	0.75	0.602	0.08	0.836	0.817	0.833	0.655	0.647	0.66
	COD10K	C2FNet	0.701	0.499	0.069	0.786	0.782	0.789	0.542	0.547	0.56
	NC4K	C2FNet	0.727	0.586	0.092	0.81	0.796	0.803	0.643	0.64	0.647

Table 11: COD-SR-C2FNet-TSCVT

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.799	0.730	0.077	0.869	0.859	0.869	0.777	0.770	0.779
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.893	0.845	0.028	0.948	0.947	0.958	0.856	0.857	0.877
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.811	0.691	0.036	0.890	0.887	0.896	0.718	0.725	0.742
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.840	0.770	0.048	0.900	0.896	0.904	0.799	0.802	0.814
ART	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.652	0.492	0.136	0.747	0.72	0.735	0.554	0.542	0.554
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.733	0.589	0.087	0.83	0.805	0.814	0.644	0.634	0.642
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.696	0.496	0.076	0.777	0.774	0.787	0.54	0.543	0.557
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.719	0.577	0.098	0.8	0.789	0.796	0.63	0.628	0.636
EDSR	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.643	0.478	0.14	0.736	0.707	0.722	0.542	0.528	0.536
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.722	0.568	0.092	0.809	0.79	0.798	0.625	0.612	0.621
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.693	0.491	0.077	0.774	0.769	0.782	0.535	0.537	0.552
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.715	0.57	0.099	0.796	0.785	0.792	0.621	0.62	0.628
SWINIR	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.651	0.491	0.141	0.734	0.71	0.723	0.545	0.54	0.547
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.72	0.569	0.093	0.813	0.79	0.8	0.63	0.614	0.626
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.694	0.493	0.077	0.775	0.773	0.786	0.536	0.539	0.554
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.715	0.57	0.1	0.796	0.785	0.792	0.622	0.621	0.629
ESRGAN	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.626	0.456	0.142	0.725	0.692	0.711	0.53	0.513	0.528
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.733	0.59	0.082	0.826	0.814	0.822	0.645	0.639	0.649
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.689	0.485	0.072	0.78	0.774	0.784	0.534	0.535	0.546
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.696	0.543	0.099	0.789	0.773	0.783	0.607	0.6	0.606
CAT	CAMO	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.65	0.489	0.138	0.743	0.719	0.735	0.553	0.54	0.552
	CHAMELEON	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.729	0.583	0.088	0.816	0.796	0.804	0.638	0.629	0.636
	COD10K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.697	0.497	0.075	0.78	0.775	0.788	0.542	0.544	0.559
	NC4K	C2FNet-TSCVT	0.719	0.578	0.098	0.8	0.791	0.798	0.629	0.628	0.636

Table 12: COD-SR-CamoFormer

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.872	0.831	0.046	0.931	0.929	0.938	0.853	0.854	0.868
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.91	0.859	0.023	0.957	0.956	0.965	0.868	0.874	0.895
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.869	0.786	0.023	0.931	0.932	0.939	0.794	0.811	0.829
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.892	0.847	0.030	0.941	0.939	0.946	0.863	0.868	0.880
ART	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.766	0.661	0.094	0.843	0.835	0.845	0.712	0.709	0.723
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.806	0.693	0.06	0.872	0.867	0.88	0.73	0.732	0.752
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.79	0.652	0.046	0.857	0.862	0.872	0.676	0.691	0.709
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.804	0.706	0.065	0.865	0.864	0.872	0.742	0.745	0.759
EDSR	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.76	0.655	0.099	0.84	0.83	0.84	0.707	0.703	0.715
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.809	0.697	0.057	0.873	0.875	0.89	0.731	0.735	0.76
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.788	0.649	0.047	0.853	0.859	0.87	0.673	0.687	0.706
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.803	0.704	0.066	0.863	0.862	0.871	0.738	0.742	0.757
SWINIR	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.761	0.657	0.098	0.843	0.832	0.843	0.709	0.705	0.72
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.806	0.693	0.06	0.868	0.867	0.884	0.726	0.731	0.754
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.788	0.648	0.046	0.853	0.861	0.871	0.671	0.686	0.706
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.802	0.702	0.067	0.862	0.861	0.869	0.738	0.741	0.756
ESRGAN	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.725	0.607	0.107	0.82	0.804	0.815	0.669	0.661	0.669
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.798	0.685	0.059	0.886	0.877	0.889	0.726	0.729	0.747
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.779	0.634	0.046	0.853	0.857	0.866	0.662	0.675	0.693
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.785	0.677	0.07	0.853	0.85	0.859	0.717	0.72	0.734
CAT	CAMO	CamoFormer	0.764	0.66	0.096	0.842	0.833	0.843	0.712	0.708	0.723
	CHAMELEON	CamoFormer	0.809	0.696	0.059	0.871	0.87	0.883	0.73	0.735	0.756
	COD10K	CamoFormer	0.791	0.653	0.045	0.858	0.863	0.872	0.678	0.692	0.71
	NC4K	CamoFormer	0.805	0.708	0.065	0.866	0.865	0.873	0.743	0.747	0.761

Table 13: COD-SR-DGNet

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	DGNet	0.839	0.769	0.057	0.906	0.901	0.915	0.804	0.806	0.822
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.89	0.816	0.029	0.935	0.938	0.956	0.822	0.834	0.865
	COD10K	DGNet	0.822	0.693	0.033	0.879	0.896	0.911	0.698	0.728	0.759
	NC4K	DGNet	0.857	0.784	0.042	0.910	0.911	0.922	0.803	0.814	0.833
ART	CAMO	DGNet	0.738	0.607	0.101	0.829	0.799	0.816	0.678	0.661	0.672
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.821	0.697	0.051	0.886	0.891	0.914	0.72	0.73	0.764
	COD10K	DGNet	0.763	0.589	0.05	0.821	0.839	0.858	0.61	0.635	0.665
	NC4K	DGNet	0.786	0.667	0.069	0.853	0.85	0.863	0.708	0.714	0.731
EDSR	CAMO	DGNet	0.738	0.608	0.103	0.828	0.801	0.818	0.677	0.662	0.674
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.822	0.698	0.051	0.883	0.886	0.91	0.719	0.731	0.767
	COD10K	DGNet	0.762	0.588	0.05	0.82	0.839	0.857	0.609	0.633	0.664
	NC4K	DGNet	0.785	0.665	0.07	0.851	0.849	0.862	0.706	0.712	0.73
SWINIR	CAMO	DGNet	0.736	0.604	0.103	0.826	0.799	0.819	0.675	0.659	0.67
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.821	0.696	0.051	0.885	0.887	0.911	0.72	0.729	0.766
	COD10K	DGNet	0.761	0.586	0.05	0.819	0.837	0.856	0.608	0.632	0.662
	NC4K	DGNet	0.784	0.664	0.07	0.85	0.849	0.862	0.705	0.711	0.729
ESRGAN	CAMO	DGNet	0.725	0.591	0.109	0.816	0.791	0.807	0.662	0.65	0.663
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.818	0.695	0.052	0.876	0.877	0.903	0.719	0.727	0.761
	COD10K	DGNet	0.758	0.581	0.051	0.818	0.837	0.857	0.603	0.627	0.658
	NC4K	DGNet	0.778	0.655	0.072	0.848	0.846	0.859	0.697	0.703	0.721
CAT	CAMO	DGNet	0.736	0.605	0.102	0.827	0.797	0.815	0.676	0.659	0.67
	CHAMELEON	DGNet	0.822	0.698	0.051	0.884	0.889	0.911	0.719	0.731	0.768
	COD10K	DGNet	0.763	0.588	0.05	0.82	0.839	0.857	0.61	0.634	0.664
	NC4K	DGNet	0.786	0.667	0.069	0.853	0.85	0.863	0.709	0.714	0.731

Table 14: COD-SR-FAPNet

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	FAPNet	0.815	0.734	0.076	0.877	0.865	0.880	0.776	0.776	0.792
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.893	0.825	0.028	0.925	0.94	0.956	0.827	0.842	0.869
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.822	0.694	0.036	0.875	0.888	0.902	0.707	0.731	0.758
	NC4K	FAPNet	0.851	0.775	0.047	0.903	0.899	0.910	0.804	0.810	0.826
ART	CAMO	FAPNet	0.704	0.551	0.13	0.791	0.761	0.781	0.631	0.608	0.624
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.793	0.644	0.071	0.856	0.847	0.879	0.686	0.688	0.732
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.732	0.527	0.07	0.771	0.789	0.817	0.557	0.578	0.615
	NC4K	FAPNet	0.753	0.603	0.092	0.813	0.805	0.824	0.654	0.656	0.679
EDSR	CAMO	FAPNet	0.706	0.551	0.132	0.789	0.761	0.782	0.627	0.608	0.625
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.793	0.64	0.074	0.847	0.842	0.878	0.68	0.684	0.727
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.731	0.525	0.071	0.769	0.787	0.819	0.556	0.576	0.615
	NC4K	BGNet	0.75	0.597	0.093	0.81	0.802	0.823	0.649	0.651	0.676
SWINIR	CAMO	FAPNet	0.706	0.553	0.13	0.796	0.765	0.787	0.629	0.61	0.628
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.793	0.638	0.072	0.849	0.836	0.865	0.684	0.684	0.721
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.73	0.523	0.072	0.768	0.785	0.816	0.554	0.574	0.611
	NC4K	FAPNet	0.749	0.596	0.093	0.808	0.801	0.821	0.648	0.649	0.674
ESRGAN	CAMO	FAPNet	0.679	0.509	0.136	0.77	0.733	0.757	0.593	0.571	0.588
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.783	0.628	0.077	0.839	0.836	0.871	0.679	0.675	0.702
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.723	0.513	0.072	0.769	0.785	0.817	0.547	0.565	0.6
	NC4K	FAPNet	0.732	0.572	0.097	0.803	0.789	0.809	0.633	0.63	0.649
CAT	CAMO	FAPNet	0.711	0.561	0.127	0.799	0.771	0.794	0.636	0.618	0.635
	CHAMELEON	FAPNet	0.8	0.656	0.069	0.856	0.85	0.882	0.696	0.7	0.74
	COD10K	FAPNet	0.732	0.528	0.07	0.772	0.789	0.818	0.559	0.58	0.616
	NC4K	FAPNet	0.754	0.605	0.091	0.814	0.806	0.826	0.657	0.658	0.682

Table 15: COD-SR-Sinet

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	Sinet	0.745	0.644	0.092	0.825	0.804	0.829	0.712	0.702	0.708
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.872	0.806	0.034	0.938	0.936	0.946	0.823	0.827	0.838
	COD10K	Sinet	0.776	0.631	0.043	0.867	0.864	0.874	0.667	0.679	0.691
	NC4K	Sinet	0.808	0.723	0.058	0.883	0.871	0.883	0.768	0.769	0.775
ART	CAMO	Sinet	0.64	0.463	0.13	0.73	0.682	0.714	0.557	0.524	0.536
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.752	0.612	0.072	0.847	0.816	0.829	0.673	0.661	0.667
	COD10K	Sinet	0.708	0.513	0.061	0.805	0.796	0.803	0.563	0.566	0.575
	NC4K	Sinet	0.724	0.586	0.088	0.813	0.794	0.804	0.65	0.643	0.648
EDSR	CAMO	Sinet	0.636	0.458	0.133	0.724	0.682	0.709	0.548	0.518	0.527
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.747	0.604	0.076	0.833	0.81	0.817	0.663	0.652	0.658
	COD10K	Sinet	0.708	0.513	0.062	0.803	0.794	0.8	0.563	0.566	0.575
	NC4K	BGNet	0.724	0.586	0.088	0.815	0.794	0.805	0.65	0.643	0.648
SWINIR	CAMO	Sinet	0.638	0.461	0.131	0.729	0.684	0.716	0.556	0.522	0.535
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.746	0.599	0.077	0.827	0.815	0.824	0.652	0.646	0.654
	COD10K	Sinet	0.708	0.514	0.062	0.802	0.795	0.801	0.562	0.567	0.576
	NC4K	Sinet	0.724	0.586	0.089	0.812	0.795	0.804	0.649	0.643	0.647
ESRGAN	CAMO	Sinet	0.622	0.437	0.134	0.717	0.67	0.715	0.529	0.499	0.516
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.728	0.577	0.079	0.809	0.795	0.802	0.631	0.624	0.63
	COD10K	Sinet	0.7	0.5	0.063	0.8	0.787	0.795	0.551	0.554	0.561
	NC4K	Sinet	0.71	0.567	0.09	0.807	0.784	0.8	0.639	0.628	0.633
CAT	CAMO	Sinet	0.643	0.471	0.129	0.74	0.696	0.727	0.56	0.531	0.541
	CHAMELEON	Sinet	0.756	0.621	0.071	0.844	0.816	0.829	0.682	0.671	0.678
	COD10K	Sinet	0.708	0.514	0.061	0.805	0.796	0.802	0.565	0.567	0.575
	NC4K	Sinet	0.726	0.59	0.087	0.815	0.796	0.807	0.654	0.647	0.652

Table 16: COD-SINet-v2

	Dataset	method	Smeasure	wFmeasure	MAE	adpEm	meanEm	maxEm	adpFm	meanFm	maxFm
origin	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.820	0.743	0.070	0.884	0.882	0.895	0.779	0.782	0.801
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.888	0.816	0.03	0.929	0.941	0.961	0.816	0.835	0.867
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.815	0.680	0.037	0.864	0.887	0.906	0.682	0.718	0.752
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.847	0.770	0.048	0.901	0.903	0.914	0.792	0.805	0.823
ART	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.702	0.558	0.14	0.782	0.761	0.789	0.623	0.613	0.635
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.778	0.634	0.082	0.827	0.833	0.87	0.67	0.679	0.72
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.725	0.524	0.072	0.765	0.791	0.82	0.547	0.574	0.609
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.746	0.601	0.096	0.804	0.805	0.824	0.644	0.651	0.678
EDSR	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.698	0.552	0.146	0.775	0.756	0.786	0.614	0.608	0.631
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.778	0.632	0.083	0.831	0.831	0.858	0.671	0.675	0.706
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.723	0.522	0.072	0.762	0.789	0.818	0.544	0.571	0.607
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.744	0.597	0.099	0.8	0.801	0.823	0.64	0.646	0.675
SWINIR	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.698	0.552	0.144	0.777	0.76	0.793	0.615	0.608	0.634
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.775	0.627	0.083	0.824	0.831	0.87	0.663	0.672	0.717
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.723	0.522	0.072	0.761	0.789	0.819	0.544	0.571	0.608
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.744	0.597	0.098	0.8	0.802	0.822	0.64	0.647	0.674
ESRGAN	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.672	0.518	0.146	0.777	0.751	0.771	0.591	0.577	0.589
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.78	0.63	0.075	0.831	0.842	0.873	0.668	0.677	0.709
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.72	0.514	0.07	0.766	0.792	0.822	0.54	0.566	0.6
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.729	0.573	0.099	0.798	0.793	0.809	0.625	0.628	0.647
CAT	CAMO	SINet-v2	0.702	0.558	0.141	0.781	0.764	0.793	0.621	0.613	0.637
	CHAMELEON	SINet-v2	0.781	0.641	0.08	0.827	0.835	0.868	0.676	0.683	0.722
	COD10K	SINet-v2	0.725	0.525	0.072	0.765	0.791	0.82	0.548	0.574	0.61
	NC4K	SINet-v2	0.748	0.604	0.096	0.804	0.806	0.826	0.646	0.653	0.681