

Unification of derivation process for merge mode and MVP

JCTVC-F419

Hiroya Nakamura, Shigeru Fukushima, Masayoshi Nishitani

JVC KENWOOD Holdings, Inc.

Copyright © 2011 JVC KENWOOD Holdings Inc. All rights reserved.

JVC KENWOOD Holdings, Inc.

1 Overview

- Motivation
- Proposed technique
 - Proposal 1: for merge mode
 - Proposal 2: for MVP
- Simulation Results

Overall BD-rate


 - Proposal 1: 0.1-0.2% loss for merge mode
 - Proposal 2: approximately no gain and loss for MVP
 - Proposal 1 and 2: 0.0-0.2% loss for merge mode and MVP
- Conclusions

2

Motivation

Motivation

- Spatial neighbors.
 - merge mode: 4 spatial neighbors
 - MVP: 5 spatial neighbors




- Derivation process
 - merge mode: all 4 candidates
 - MVP: selected 2 candidates from 5 candidates


3 Proposed Techniques

- Proposal 1: for merge mode
- Proposal 2: for MVP

Position of spatial neighbors for merge mode




(a) HM3.0



(b) Proposal

Spatial derivation order for Proposal 1 (merge mode)



The number of comparison in the removal process


The number of candidates in the spatial and temporal derivation process	The number of times of comparison in the removal process	Notes
3 (=2+1)	3 [times]	Proposed technique
4 (=3+1)	6 [times]	-
5 (=4+1)	10 [times]	HM3.0
6 (=5+1)	15 [times]	-

Comparison between HM3.0 and proposed technique for merge mode


	HM3.0	Proposal 1
The number of spatial candidates	4 in 4 [positions]	Simplified 2 in 5 [positions]
Spatial derivation order	A, B, C, D	A, B, C, D, E
The number of times of comparison of redundant candidates in the spatial derivation process	0 [time]	0 [time]
The number of temporal candidates	1	1
Merging candidate list order	A, B, Col, C, D	Simplified S ₀ , S ₁ , Col
The number of times of comparison in the removal process	10 [times] (A vs B, Col, C, D, B vs Col, C, D, Col vs C, D, and C vs D)	Simplified 3 [times] (S ₀ vs S ₁ , S ₀ vs Col, and S ₁ vs Col)

Amazon.com, Inc., Amazon.com Services LLC - Ex. 1009, Page 000010

Position for motion vector predictor (MVP)




(a) HM3.0



(b) Proposed technique

Spatial derivation order for Proposal 2 (MVP)



Comparison between HM3.0 and proposed technique for MVP

	HM3.0	Proposal 2
The number of spatial candidates	2 in 5 [positions]	2 in 5 [positions]
Grouping of the neighbors in the spatial derivation process	Group A: Left (A_0, A_1) Group B: Upper (B_0, B_1, B_2)	Simplified without grouping
Spatial derivation order	Group A: A_0, A_1 Group B: B_0, B_1, B_2	Simplified C, D, A, B, E
The number of times of checking per spatial neighbors in the spatial derivation process	2 [times]	Simplified 1 [time]
The number of times of comparison of redundant candidates in the spatial derivation process	6 [times] (mvLXA vs mvLXB ₀ , mvLXA vs mvLXB ₁ , and mvLXA vs mvLXB ₂) x 2	Simplified 0 [time]
The number of temporal candidates	1	1
MVP list order	mvLXA, mvLXB, mvLXCol	mvLXS ₀ , mvLXS ₁ , mvLXCol
The number of times of comparison in the removal process	2 [times] (mvLXA vs mvLXCol, and mvLXB vs mvLXCol)	3 [times] (mvLXS ₀ vs mvLXS ₁ , mvLXS ₀ vs mvLXCol, and mvLXS ₁ vs mvLXCol)

Comparison of derivation process between merge mode and MVP

	Proposal 1: merge mode	Proposal 2: MVP
The number of spatial candidates	2 of 5	2 of 5
Grouping in the spatial derivation process	without grouping	without grouping
Spatial derivation order	A, B, C, D, E	different C, D, A, B, E
The number of times of comparison of redundant candidates in the spatial derivation process	0 [time]	0 [time]
The number of temporal candidates	1	1
Merge/MVP list order	S_0 , S_1 , Col	mvLXS ₀ , mvLXS ₁ , mvLXCol
The number of times of comparison in the removal process	3 [times] (S_0 vs S_1 , S_0 vs Col, and S_1 vs Col)	3 [times] (mvLXS ₀ vs mvLXS ₁ , mvLXS ₀ vs mvLXCol, and mvLXS ₁ vs mvLXCol)

4 Experiments

Simulation results of Proposal 1 for merge mode

■ Overall BD-rate: 0.1-0.2% loss

	Random Access HE			Random Access LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0
Class B	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
Class C	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
Class D	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Class E						
Overall	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Enc Time[%]	99%			99%		
Dec Time[%]	101%			101%		

	Low delay B HE			Low delay B LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A						
Class B	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
Class C	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Class D	0.0	-0.3	0.4	0.2	0.0	-0.1
Class E	-0.1	0.4	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	0.6
Overall	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1
Enc Time[%]	99%			99%		
Dec Time[%]	100%			99%		

Simulation results of Proposal 2 for MVP

- Overall BD-rate **approximately no gain and loss**

	Random Access HE			Random Access LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0
Class B	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Class C	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Class D	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1
Class E						
Overall	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Enc Time[%]	100%			100%		
Dec Time[%]	101%			101%		

	Low delay B HE			Low delay B LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A						
Class B	0.0	0.1	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.0
Class C	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.2
Class D	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	-0.3	0.0
Class E	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Overall	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.0
Enc Time[%]	100%			99%		
Dec Time[%]	102%			101%		

Simulation results of Proposal 1 and Proposal 2

■ Overall BD-rate 0.0-0.2% loss

	Random Access HE			Random Access LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
Class B	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
Class C	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
Class D	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Class E						
Overall	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Enc Time[%]	99%			99%		
Dec Time[%]	101%			101%		

	Low delay B HE			Low delay B LC		
	Y	U	V	Y	U	V
Class A						
Class B	0.1	0.2	-0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Class C	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
Class D	0.0	-0.3	0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0
Class E	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.1	-0.3	0.3
Overall	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1
Enc Time[%]	98%			99%		
Dec Time[%]	102%			101%		

5

Conclusions

- We would like to study in CE activity:
 - Each of the number of spatial candidates (2, 3, 4 and 5).
 - Each of the method (the number of times) of checking in the spatial derivation process
 - Comparison/no comparison of redundant candidates in the spatial derivation process
 - Evaluation of this proposed technique under robustness conditions

