Supplementary Materials

Zihan Zhou, Jing Li, Yuhui Quan*, Ruotao Xu

I. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ON SCREEN CONTENT IMAGES

It is interesting to see how our method performs on other types of images such as screen content images. Thus, we also conducted the performance evaluation of the proposed method on the SIQAD [1], a screen content image dataset. Table I summarizes the characteristics of SIQAD. We select SSRM [2], EFS [3], FSIM [4], SSIM [5] and PSNR for comparison. The results are listed in Table II. From the table we can see that all the compared methods did not perform well on SIQAD, and the proposed method outperformed all compared methods except SSRM.

The performance of all compared methods on the SIQAD dataset is not as good as that on the natural image datasets. This is not surprising, as all the compared methods are designed for or trained on natural images. Particularly, screen content images have noticeably different characteristics from natural images, *e.g.* a screen content image contain texts, graphics and photo together, which is different from natural scenes. See Fig. 1 for two sample images from the SIQAD dataset. Such different characteristics make it hard that a metric designed for natural images can adapt to the screen content images.



Fig. 1: Two sample images in SIQAD dataset

TABLE I: Characteristics of SIQAD dataset.

# Reference	# Distortion	# Distortion	Distortion Levels
Images	Images	Types	per Distortion Type
20	980	7	7

TABLE II: Performance comparisons on SIQAD dataset.

Criteria	OURS	EFS	SSRM	PSNR	SSIM	FSIM
PLCC	0.6007	0.5154	0.6745	0.5869	0.5912	0.5902
SROCC	0.6046	0.4908	0.6589	0.5604	0.5836	0.5819
KROCC	0.4438	0.3521	0.4908	0.4257	0.4235	0.425
RMSE	11.443	12.266	10.568	11.589	11.545	11.555
MAE	8.7746	9.6982	8.2029	9.0393	9.0934	9.0116

Zihan Zhou, Yuhui Quan and Ruotao Xu are with the School of Computer Science and Engineering at South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510006, China. Yuhui Quan is also with the Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Computational Intelligence and Cyberspace Information, Guangzhou 510006, China. Jing Li is with the Moku Lab, Alibaba Group, Beijing 100016, China. Asterisk indicates the corresponding author.

References

- [1] H. Yang, Y. Fang, and W. Lin, "Perceptual quality assessment of screen content images," IEEE Trans. Image Process., vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 4408-4421, 2015.
- [2] A. Ahar, A. Barri, and P. Schelkens, "From sparse coding significance to perceptual quality: A new approach for image quality assessment," IEEE Trans. Image Process., vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 879-893, 2018.
- [3] Z. Shi, J. Zhang, Q. Cao, K. Pang, and T. Luo, "Full-reference image quality assessment based on image segmentation with edge feature," Signal Process., vol. 145, pp. 99–105, 2018.
 [4] L. Zhang, L. Zhang, X. Mou, and D. Zhang, "Fsim: A feature similarity index for image quality assessment," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 20, no. 8,
- [4] D. Zhang, P. Zhang, Y. Proc, and D. Zhang, T. Huor, and D. Zhang, T. Huor, and D. Zhang, Y. Process, and P. Process, and and p. Process, and and p. Process, an