

Toward Super-Resolution for Appearance-Based Gaze Estimation

Galen O’Shea
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON, Canada

galenoshea@cmail.carleton.ca

Majid Komeili
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON, Canada

majid.komeili@carleton.ca

Abstract

Gaze tracking is a valuable tool with a broad range of applications in various fields, including medicine, psychology, virtual reality, marketing, and safety. Therefore, it is essential to have gaze tracking software that is cost-efficient and high-performing. Accurately predicting gaze remains a difficult task, particularly in real-world situations where images are affected by motion blur, video compression, and noise. Super-resolution has been shown to improve image quality from a visual perspective. This work examines the usefulness of super-resolution for improving appearance-based gaze tracking. We show that not all SR models preserve the gaze direction. We propose a two-step framework based on SwinIR super-resolution model. The proposed method consistently outperforms the state-of-the-art, particularly in scenarios involving low-resolution or degraded images. Furthermore, we examine the use of super-resolution through the lens of self-supervised learning for gaze prediction. Self-supervised learning aims to learn from unlabelled data to reduce the amount of required labeled data for downstream tasks. We propose a novel architecture called “SuperVision” by fusing an SR backbone network to a ResNet18 (with some skip connections). The proposed SuperVision method uses 5x less labeled data and yet outperforms, by 15%, the state-of-the-art method of GazeTR which uses 100% of training data. We will make our code publicly available upon publication.

1. Introduction

Gaze estimation has been regarded as an valuable research area with a broad range of applications. Research into gaze tracking has often been divided into model-based and appearance-based approaches. While model-based methods rely on specialized hardware, appearance-based methods only require a camera [17]. Although there have been improvements in appearance-based gaze tracking, accurately predicting gaze remains a difficult task, particularly outside controlled environments and curated datasets




Figure 1. Top: an example of super-resolution improving gaze prediction. Bottom: an example of super-resolution degrading the gaze prediction by hallucinating a frontal gaze. The blue line is the gaze prediction and the red line is the ground truth. Super-resolution is done using SwinIR [24] and GFP-GAN [43] for the top and the bottom rows respectively. Gaze Estimation is done using Full-Face [52].

[1, 14, 39, 48]. Furthermore, research in appearance-based gaze tracking compensate for the lack of specialized hardware by using large and complex machine learning algorithms to extract information [2,3,51], leaving the data overlooked.

Super-resolution is a technique used to increase the resolution of an image beyond the original image resolution. Super-resolution has been shown to improve image quality from a visual perspective [23, 24, 35, 43–45]. For instance, SR can increase detail and clarity while removing degradations such as motion blur, file compression, and pixelation. Super-resolution has been shown to be useful in many applications, including medical imaging [36], remote sensing [25], surveillance and video processing [26]. While SR has been shown to create visually appealing images, its usefulness for gaze prediction has not been investigated. Figure 1 shows SR as a preprocessing step for gaze prediction. We rigorously examine the usefulness of SR for gaze predic-

tion.

Furthermore, we examine the use of SR through the lens of self-supervised learning for gaze prediction. Self-supervised learning allows a machine learning model to learn from unlabelled data which can be easier and less expensive to acquire than labeled data. For example, a self-supervised model might be trained to predict the rotation or color of an image which can be done without the need for manual annotation or labelling. Once the self-supervised model is trained, it can be fine-tuned for a specific task using a smaller amount of labeled data. Gaze prediction, like many traditional supervised learning tasks, requires a large amount of labeled data. A sample efficient model opens up possibility of building gaze models for scenarios where obtaining a large labelled gaze dataset is challenging, for example gaze tracking in infants [13], older adults [4] or various types of animals. Gaze tracking in animals can be useful for studying their behaviour, cognition, and perception [16, 33, 47].

Contributions of this paper are as follows.

1. We rigorously examine the usefulness of SR when used as a preprocessing step for appearance-based gaze prediction. We show that not all SR models preserve the gaze direction.
2. We propose a two-step framework based on SR and achieve state-of-the-art results on the MPIIFaceGaze [51] dataset. Additionally, the performance of the proposed method was evaluated on low-resolution images and various degradations, and the proposed method consistently outperformed other methods.
3. We propose a novel architecture called “SuperVision” by fusing an SR backbone network to a ResNet (with some skip connections). The proposed SuperVision method uses only 20% of the labeled data and yet outperforms, by 15%, the state-of-the-art method of GazeTR [10] which uses 100% of data.

2. Related Work

2.1. Traditional Approach

In the field of gaze tracking research, there are two primary approaches: model-based and appearance-based methods [17]. Model-based methods aim to predict gaze by using either a geometric 3D eye model that analyzes the corneal reflection [32], or shape-based methods that utilize the pupil centre [42] or contours of the iris [14]. Advancements in corneal-reflection techniques have enabled the transition from fixed head positions [31] to multiple head poses and lighting conditions [54]. However, due to the complexity of these methods, researchers often employ costly and specialized hardware (e.g., depth sensors)

that may not be practical for general-purpose gaze tracking [1, 14, 39, 48]. Additionally, although these methods exhibit outstanding performance in a controlled laboratory setting, they are less reliable in low light conditions and unconstrained environments.

Appearance-based methods frame gaze estimation as a regression problem by mapping gaze images to a corresponding gaze vector, while avoiding the need for specialized hardware and using only a camera. However, early appearance-based methods required time-consuming head-pose calibration for each participant, which led to research on reducing the number of training examples using semi-supervised Gaussian regression methods [46] and finding an optimal set of training samples using adaptive linear regression [28]. Despite these efforts, calibration remained insufficient as models failed to generalize to new subjects and head poses, leading to research on solving head pose and subject-related issues using a pose-based clustering method [38] and compensating for bias via regression [27]. To address free head motion, eye image synthesis was later employed [29]. Generalization problems were further handled using cross-subject training methods [30] and learning-by-synthesis methods [37].

2.2. Deep Learning Approach

Early approaches to gaze tracking faced significant challenges in adapting to new subjects and positions despite efforts to enhance their performance. As a result, research shifted to deep learning approaches such as the Multimodal Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), which concatenate eye images with a head pose estimate [51]. In subsequent work, the authors designed a VGG-inspired architecture that extended their previous work [53]. Other methods included dilated-convolutions to extract high-level features without reducing spatial resolution [6]. In related studies on multi-stream CNNs, researchers adopted data fusion, which involved merging datasets while maintaining separate validation sets to evaluate the performance of each dataset independently [2]. Although state-of-the-art performance was achieved, the variation in accuracy across datasets was attributed to differences in the resolution of the eye patch. The researchers suggested that deep learning models for gaze estimation could benefit from higher accuracy if the datasets had more pixels within each eye patch [2].

2.2.1 Attention Approach

Studies have indicated that combining eye feature maps can enhance the accuracy of gaze tracking. For instance, a study utilized a VGG-16 network per eye, with concatenated downstream features [11]. Other works, such as [6], employed quad-stream architecture to extract singular and joint features from both eyes. Subsequently, researchers ex-

plored the use of the attention mechanism to extract joint eye features. In one novel approach, [3] proposed an Adaptive Feature Fusion technique that stacked eye feature maps based on their similarity, using a self-attention mechanism. More recently, transformer architectures have emerged as dominant in the field, including for gaze tracking. The current state-of-the-art model, GazeTR, uses a hybrid CNN and transformer architecture [9].

2.2.2 Generative Adversarial Networks Approach

In the past, the predominant approach to solving the gaze estimation problem has been to develop complex models, with limited attention given to improving the quality of the data. While a few studies have utilized generative adversarial networks (GANs) to enhance data quality by improving lighting conditions [22] or removing artifacts from glasses [34], these niche approaches have demonstrated limited practical success, as they do not address the fundamental challenge of obtaining high-quality datasets.

2.3. Super-Resolution

The first application of GANs to super-resolution was in SRGAN, which outperformed prior methods and achieved state-of-the-art results [23]. The authors attributed this, in part, to their use of a perceptual loss function that accounted for perceptual similarity instead of just similarity in pixel space. At that time, a common problem with super-resolution was the presence of artifacts when upsampling. ESRGAN addressed this issue by identifying that batch normalization layers tended to create unwanted artifacts [45]. They also improved the perceptual loss function and used Residual-in-Residual Dense Blocks to generate more realistic images consistently. Additionally, they later proposed REAL-ESRGAN, which incorporated a u-net discriminator and spectral normalization [44]. They also developed a complex degradation method that used only synthetic data for Real-World Degradations.

Blind face restoration is often challenging because it requires prior knowledge, such as facial geometry, to restore realistic details. GFP-GAN utilized generative facial prior in the image restoration process and achieved realistic details and state-of-the-art results [43]. Other attempts at image restoration have employed transformers. For example, one study utilized a shifted window transformer as a deep feature extractor in a model called SwinIR, which achieved state-of-the-art results with up to 67% fewer parameters [24]. However, GANs for super-resolution are becoming less popular, as the current state of the art is based on an iterative refinement method [35], which significantly outperforms previous works.

While most existing methods typically employ classical degradation methods such as downsampling to generate

low-resolution images, Real-ESRGAN utilized synthetic data and a complex degradation model that aimed to simulate real-world complex degradations [44]. Their degradation model involved combining multiple classical degradations, including Gaussian filters for blurring, downsampling using interpolating methods, adding Gaussian, colour, and other types of noise, and reducing quality through JPEG compression. However, other researchers found that the degradation model used by Real-ESRGAN lacked diversity, and they addressed this issue by expanding the model through random shuffling of the process, adding different levels of noise and compression, and introducing processed camera sensor noise and RAW image noise [49].

2.4. Self-Supervised Learning

Self-supervised learning has emerged as a powerful technique for learning rich and meaningful representations from unlabeled data. This technique involves training a model to predict a pretext task from the input data, which then results in learning useful representations that can be transferred to downstream tasks. One popular form of self-supervised learning is contrastive learning, which aims to learn representations by contrasting positive and negative pairs of samples [15, 18, 40]. SimCLR [5] has been one of the most successful and extensively used approaches in this field. It has achieved state-of-the-art results on various benchmarks, including ImageNet and COCO. The authors have demonstrated that this technique is effective in pretraining models for several downstream tasks, such as object detection, instance segmentation, and semantic segmentation.

3. On the Usefulness of SR for Gaze Prediction

3.1. Not All SR Models Preserve Gaze

Prior studies have suggested that using face images with higher pixel density in the eye regions could enhance the accuracy of gaze estimation using deep learning [2]. Super-resolution refers to the process of increasing the resolution of an image by recovering or generating high-resolution images from low-resolution inputs. It has been shown to be useful in various computer vision tasks, but its usefulness for gaze prediction has not been studied. In particular, while SR can increase detail and clarity, it is not apparent if the SR process alters the gaze in the resulting image. Along this line, we examine two different SR models.

Although several SR models are available, we focused on GFP-GAN [43] and SwinIR [24] due to their high performance in PSNR and SSIM, which are commonly used to evaluate the quality of generative image techniques. These models adopt distinct approaches to SR; GFP-GAN leverages facial priors for image restoration, while SwinIR utilizes a transformer. Furthermore, GFP-GAN was pretrained using the FFHQ dataset [20] while SwinIR was pretrained

on DIV2K [19] and Flickr2K [41]. For gaze, we use the Full-Face model [52] which is widely considered as the basis for much of the current research in appearance-based gaze tracking. We use the MPIIFaceGaze dataset [51] which comprises 45,000 images of size 448×448 , gathered from 15 subjects of different ethnicities under natural lighting conditions. To evaluate the efficacy of the proposed method, the images are first downsampled to a size of 112×112 allowing room for 4x upsampling. To replicate real-world degradations, we used the method used in [49] to degrade the images. Subsequently, we applied one of the pretrained SR models (GFP-GAN [43] or SwinIR [24]) to upscale the images back to size 448×448 . To ensure that upscaling did not serve as a confounding variable, we also upscaled the dataset using bicubic interpolation to create a baseline. We then train and evaluate Full-Face with each of the three new datasets using a leave-one-out cross-validation approach. This involved training on 14 of the 15 participants and testing on the one participant that was excluded. We repeated this process for each participant to calculate the average point of gaze (POG) error. The epoch with the highest test performance in Table 1.

The aim of the initial experiment was to assess how various SR techniques compare to an interpolation baseline when applied to images with and without degradations. The experiment utilized Full-Face [52] as the gaze model and downsampled data of size 112.

The results of the scenario without degradations, shown in Table 1 were unexpected, with GFP-GAN performing 8.4% worse than the baseline, while SwinIR-4x exhibited a 2.1% improvement. In the degraded scenario, all interpolation methods achieved mediocre results compared to the first scenario, likely due to the presence of complex degradations. Once again, GFP-GAN under-performed relative to the baseline, however, SwinIR-4x outperformed the baseline by 7.3%. The results indicate that while GFP-GAN can generate visually sharp images, it is inadequate for the task of gaze estimation. On the other hand, SwinIR outperformed the baseline with both regular and degraded images. The most interesting finding is that SwinIR achieved a 5.2% improvement in relative performance indicating that it was more effective in degraded scenarios, emphasizing the applicability of SR in real-world situations. While this experiment shows a large contrast in SR methods, it has also proved that SR can be an effective tool for gaze estimation.

As demonstrated in Table 1, not all SR methods are suitable for task dependent image restoration. GFP-GAN’s poor gaze tracking performance might be attributed to the use of facial priors, which bias the model into hallucinating facial features from noise. Additionally, “in the face of uncertainty”, GFP-GAN’s dependence on facial priors resulted in restored images having a similar gaze focused on the centre of the screen. This gaze hallucination is most evi-

Degradation Type	Interpolation Type	POG
None	Interpolation	4.20°
	GFP-GAN-4x	4.59°
	SwinIR-4x	4.11°
Complex Degradations	Interpolation	5.47°
	GFP-GAN-4x	5.76°
	SwinIR-4x	5.10°

Table 1. Comparison of different SR methods for gaze prediction. GFP-GAN performs worse than a simple interpolation. SwinIR significantly improves the gaze prediction. In all cases, Full-Face is used as the gaze model.

dent when the input images are significantly degraded, indicating that GFP-GAN is susceptible to mode collapse. The issue of mode collapse is apparent in the hallucinated gazes depicted in Figure 2. Unlike other restoration approaches, GFP-GAN was trained on the FFHQ dataset [20], which contains mostly images of people looking directly at the camera. Since GFP-GAN does not attempt to maintain the original gaze and is influenced by facial priors, the reconstructed faces have their gazes centred and therefore “looks can deceiving”.

3.2. Improving Gaze Estimation with SR

In this section, to further improve the gaze prediction results, Full-Face is replaced with the state-of-the-art model, GazeTR [9] which uses a hybrid CNN and transformer architecture. Considering the poor performance of GFP-GAN, as discussed in the previous section, only SwinIR will be used for the remaining experiments. We demonstrate that the resulting framework surpasses GazeTR and produces state-of-the-art results on the MPIIFaceGaze dataset [51]. To reproduce claims by the authors, GazeTR was pretrained on ETH-XGaze which is a dataset consisting of over one million high-resolution gaze images presented in multiple head poses. The dataset was collected from 110 subjects using multiple SLR cameras, lighting conditions and a calibrated ground truth [50].

The proposed method (second section in Table 2) uses additional preprocessing techniques. “SwinIR-2x Downsampled” upscales the initial 224×224 data (Table 2 “Input” column) by 2x to a size of 448×448 followed by downsampling back to 224×224 for a fair comparison to GazeTR. The 224×224 data is also upsampled to 448×448 using bicubic interpolation to give a fair comparison. “SwinIR-2x” uses SR to upscale the data 2x, and is kept at size 448×448 to compare to the interpolated baseline mentioned previously. Finally, the original 448×448 high-resolution data is used with GazeTR as an upper limit on performance.

The first section in Table 2 demonstrates prior works performance on images of size 224×224 , while the second section demonstrates results from our second experiment. The




Figure 2. Gaze Mode Collapse. Left: original images. Centre: degraded images. Right: restored images using GFP-GAN. GFP-GAN tends to generate images where subject staring at the camera. The red arrow depicts the ground truth gaze vector while the blue is predicted.

results show "SwinIR-2x Downsampled" achieved a POG of 3.94° and demonstrated a 1.5% improvement in performance compared to GazeTR's 4.00° . The bicubic interpolation 448×448 baseline achieved a POG of 3.99° indicating that regardless of input size, GazeTR achieves 4.00° . Interestingly, "SwinIR-2x" achieved a POG of 3.90° and demonstrated a 2.3% improvement over the 448×448 baseline, showing greater relative performance when the super-resolved image is not compressed. Furthermore, "SwinIR-

Method	Input	Gaze	POG
Full-Face [52]	224	224	4.93°
RT-Gene [12]	224	224	4.66°
Dilated-Net [7]	224	224	4.42°
Gaze360 [21]	224	224	4.06°
Gaze360 [21]	224	224	4.06°
CA-Net [8]	224	224	4.27°
Mnist [51]	224	224	6.39°
GazeNet [53]	224	224	5.76°
GazeTR-Pure [9]	224	224	4.74°
GazeTR-Hybrid [9]	224	224	4.00°
Proposed SwinIR-2x Downsampled	224	224	3.94°
Proposed SwinIR-2x	224	448	3.90°

Table 2. Comparison with prior works. The gaze column denotes the size of the input into the gaze model.

2x" achieved a 1% improvement in performance over the original 448×448 high-resolution data (POG of 3.94°). The results suggest that SR can demonstrate better performance even with lower-resolution data. These findings also suggest that denoising and sharpening images play a larger role than merely increasing the image size. Finally, SR preprocessing achieves state-of-the-art results and beats GazeTR [9] by 2.3%.

3.3. Low-Resolution and Degraded Images

To further elaborate on the findings from Table 2, the performance of SR on low-resolution and degraded images was examined. Additionally, while reproducing results of GazeTR [9], it was discovered that a significant portion of its performance was attributed to its pretraining on the ETH-XGaze dataset [50]. Thus, the effect of pretraining the gaze model was also investigated.

To simulate a low-resolution setting, images were downsampled to 112×112 and also 56×56 (8x smaller than the original dataset) allowing for a comparison between SR and interpolation upscaling. The results of these experiments are shown in Table 3. To simulate real-world degradations such as motion blur, pixelation and compression, BSR-GAN's complex degradation method [49] was used and again compare SR to interpolation. Furthermore, these three experiments were repeated for GazeTR without pretraining since pretraining on a massive dataset is unrealistic and might skew performance. The pretrained experiments can be found in the second section of Table 3 and Table 4. While it is not surprising that pretrained models outperformed non-pretrained, SR exhibited improved performance relative to the interpolation baseline, irrespective of pretraining, initial image resolution or the addition of complex degradations. The experiments carried out emphasize the application of SR as a preprocessing technique, particularly in scenarios where facial images are low-resolution

(Figure 3) or have been affected by real-world degradations such as motion blur, pixelation, and compression (Figure 1).




Figure 3. The left is an image downsampled to size 56, the middle is the previous image super-resolved to 224, and the original 224 image.

Pretraining	Interpolation Type	Input	Gaze	POG
No	Interpolation	56	224	4.81°
	SwinIR-4x	56	224	4.76°
	Interpolation	112	448	4.53°
	SwinIR-4x	112	448	4.48°
Yes	Interpolation	56	224	4.31°
	SwinIR-4x	56	224	4.22°
	Interpolation	112	448	4.24°
	SwinIR-4x	112	448	4.21°

Table 3. Results on low-resolution images. GazeTR is used as the gaze model.

Pretraining	Interpolation Type	Input	Gaze	POG
No	Interpolation	112	448	5.40°
	SwinIR-4x	112	448	5.33°
Yes	Interpolation	112	448	5.37°
	SwinIR-4x	112	448	5.20°

Table 4. Results on degraded images. GazeTR is used as the gaze model.

4. Training with Less Labelled Data: a Self-supervised Approach based on SR

Research has previously shown that self-supervised learning can be an effective method for pretraining a backbone network that can be used for various downstream tasks such as object detection, instance segmentation, and semantic segmentation [5]. With this in mind, we examine SR for gaze prediction through the lens of self-supervision. The SR tasks doesn’t require any explicit labelling of the data. In particular, we propose to obtain a backbone network trained for SR on a large unlabelled dataset and subsequently use it with a relatively simple head trained on small labelled gaze dataset. The result is a sample efficient gaze model that can achieve competitive results but with much less labelled




Figure 4. SuperVision architecture.

training data. This in turn opens up possibility of building gaze models for scenarios where obtaining a large labelled gaze dataset is challenging, for example gaze tracking in infants [13] or older adults [4]. Another area that may benefit from this is gaze tracking in animals [16, 33, 47].

The intermediate representations extracted during the SR process might capture useful patterns and features for gaze prediction. Therefore, we propose a new architecture called “SuperVision” by adding residual connections from earlier layers in the SR module to later layers in the Gaze model. Concretely, the SwinIR-4x model with a ResNet18 are concatenated to produce an end-to-end model for appearance-based gaze tracking. The SR-Gaze model may lose auxiliary information during the compression of the SR output to an image. This bottleneck, coupled with the model’s depth, justifies utilizing a residual connection from earlier layers in the SR module to later layers in the Gaze model.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed method, we run experiments and compare it with SR preprocessing and an interpolation baseline. For this experiment low-resolution images of size 112 were used so that the SwinIR’s 4x upsampling outputs a reasonable 448 × 448 size. These images are then downsampled as ResNet18 accepts images of size 224. We run experiments with 5%, 10% and 20% of the labelled data. As expected, results

Interpolation Type	POG		
Interpolation	6.26°	6.06°	6.04°
SwinIR-4x Downsampled	6.20°	6.01°	5.91°
SuperVision	6.17°	5.90°	4.54°
Data Used	5%	10%	20%

*For reference, POG of GazeTR with 100% of the data is 5.37°

Table 5. Training with a small portion of the training data. A simple ResNet18 is used as the gaze model. The proposed SuperVision method uses 5x less labeled data and yet outperforms the state-of-the-art method of GazeTR which uses 100% of training data.

in Table 5 show a trend of improvement as more labelled training data are used. Particularly noteworthy is the rapid acceleration of relative improvement over the interpolation baseline, especially for SuperVision, which achieved a POG of 4.54 and demonstrated a 33% improvement at 20% training data. The SuperVision model was also evaluated without a residual connection, and the results indicated a 4.6% improvement with the inclusion of a residual connection. Moreover, we can directly compare SuperVision’s results to those of Table 4 since both models use the same data of 112 resolution with complex degradations. Despite using only 20% of the data, SuperVision displayed a 15% improvement over the state-of-the-art model of GazeTR which is pretrained on the full ETH-XGaze dataset and also uses 100% of the labeled data in MPIIFaceGaze dataset. These experiments demonstrate SR can be used to achieve a high performance with only a fraction of labelled data.

5. Limitations

One of the primary challenges we encountered during the training phase was hardware limitations. Due to these constraints, we had to rely on smaller SR models such as SwinIR-2x instead of SwinIR-4x for several experiments. The reason being that scaling up from 224×224 by 4x would not have been feasible on our Tesla V100 GPUs.

6. Conclusion

We explored the potential of SR as a preprocessing step for appearance-based gaze prediction. The study demonstrated that not all SR models are effective in preserving gaze direction. However, the proposed two-step framework based on SR achieved state-of-the-art results on the MPIIFaceGaze dataset. The method was also evaluated on low-resolution and degraded images which confirmed the effectiveness of SR. Moreover, the newly introduced SuperVision architecture, which combines SR and ResNet with skip connections, showed impressive results using only 20% of the labeled data, outperforming the state-of-the-art GazeTR method which uses 100% of the data by 15%. These findings demonstrate the potential of the proposed SuperVision method as a more efficient and effective approach to appearance-based gaze prediction.

References

- [1] Kenneth Alberto Funes Mora and Jean-Marc Odobez. Geometric generative gaze estimation (g3e) for remote rgb-d cameras. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1773–1780, 2014. 1, 2
- [2] Abid Ali and Yong-Guk Kim. Deep fusion for 3d gaze estimation from natural face images using multi-stream cnns. *IEEE Access*, 8:69212–69221, 2020. 1, 2, 3
- [3] Yiwei Bao, Yihua Cheng, Yunfei Liu, and Feng Lu. Adaptive feature fusion network for gaze tracking in mobile tablets. In *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 9936–9943. IEEE, 2021. 1, 3
- [4] GJ Chapman and Mark Andrew Hollands. Evidence for a link between changes to gaze behaviour and risk of falling in older adults during adaptive locomotion. *Gait & posture*, 24(3):288–294, 2006. 2, 6
- [5] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. 3, 6
- [6] Zhaokang Chen and Bertram E Shi. Appearance-based gaze estimation using dilated-convolutions. In *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 309–324. Springer, 2018. 2
- [7] Zhaokang Chen and Bertram E Shi. Appearance-based gaze estimation using dilated-convolutions. In *Computer Vision—ACCV 2018: 14th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Perth, Australia, December 2–6, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part VI*, pages 309–324. Springer, 2019. 5
- [8] Yihua Cheng, Shiyao Huang, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, and Feng Lu. A coarse-to-fine adaptive network for appearance-based gaze estimation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, number 07, pages 10623–10630, 2020. 5
- [9] Yihua Cheng and Feng Lu. Gaze estimation using transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14424*, 2021. 3, 4, 5
- [10] Yihua Cheng, Haofei Wang, Yiwei Bao, and Feng Lu. Appearance-based gaze estimation with deep learning: A review and benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12668*, 2021. 2
- [11] Tobias Fischer, Hyung Jin Chang, and Yiannis Demiris. Rtgene: Real-time eye gaze estimation in natural environments. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, September 2018. 2
- [12] Tobias Fischer, Hyung Jin Chang, and Yiannis Demiris. Rtgene: Real-time eye gaze estimation in natural environments. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 334–352, 2018. 5
- [13] John M Franchak, David J Heeger, Uri Hasson, and Karen E Adolph. Free viewing gaze behavior in infants and adults. *Infancy*, 21(3):262–287, 2016. 2, 6
- [14] Kenneth Alberto Funes Mora, Florent Monay, and Jean-Marc Odobez. Eyediap: A database for the development and evaluation of gaze estimation algorithms from rgb and rgb-d cameras. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*, pages 255–258, 2014. 1, 2
- [15] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre H. Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Ávila Pires, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Bilal Piot, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Rémi Munos, and Michal Valko. Bootstrap your own latent: A new approach to self-supervised learning. *CoRR*, abs/2006.07733, 2020. 3

- [16] Kun Guo, Robert G Robertson, Sasan Mahmoodi, Yoav Tadmor, and Malcolm P Young. How do monkeys view faces?—a study of eye movements. *Experimental Brain Research*, 150:363–374, 2003. 2, 6
- [17] Dan Witzner Hansen and Qiang Ji. In the eye of the beholder: A survey of models for eyes and gaze. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 32(3):478–500, 2009. 1, 2
- [18] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross B. Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. *CoRR*, abs/1911.05722, 2019. 3
- [19] Andrey Ignatov, Radu Timofte, et al. Pirm challenge on perceptual image enhancement on smartphones: report. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) Workshops*, January 2019. 4
- [20] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4401–4410, 2019. 3, 4
- [21] Petr Kellnhofer, Adria Recasens, Simon Stent, Wojciech Matusik, and Antonio Torralba. Gaze360: Physically unconstrained gaze estimation in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6912–6921, 2019. 5
- [22] Jung-Hwa Kim and Jin-Woo Jeong. Gaze estimation in the dark with generative adversarial networks. In *ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*, pages 1–3, 2020. 3
- [23] 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. 1, 3
- [24] Jingyun Liang, Jie Zhang 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. 1, 3, 4
- [25] Feng Ling and Giles M Foody. Super-resolution land cover mapping by deep learning. *Remote Sensing Letters*, 10(6):598–606, 2019. 1
- [26] Hongying Liu, Zubo Ruan, Peng Zhao, Chao Dong, Fanhua Shang, Yuanyuan Liu, Linlin Yang, and Radu Timofte. Video super-resolution based on deep learning: a comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(8):5981–6035, 2022. 1
- [27] Feng Lu, Takahiro Okabe, Yusuke Sugano, and Yoichi Sato. Learning gaze biases with head motion for head pose-free gaze estimation. *Image and Vision Computing*, 32(3):169–179, 2014. 2
- [28] Feng Lu, Yusuke Sugano, Takahiro Okabe, and Yoichi Sato. Adaptive linear regression for appearance-based gaze estimation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 36(10):2033–2046, 2014. 2
- [29] Feng Lu, Yusuke Sugano, Takahiro Okabe, and Yoichi Sato. Gaze estimation from eye appearance: A head pose-free method via eye image synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 24(11):3680–3693, 2015. 2
- [30] Kenneth Alberto Funes Mora and Jean-Marc Odobez. Person independent 3d gaze estimation from remote rgb-d cameras. In *2013 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pages 2787–2791. IEEE, 2013. 2
- [31] Carlos Hitoshi Morimoto, Arnon Amir, and Myron Flickner. Detecting eye position and gaze from a single camera and 2 light sources. In *2002 International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, volume 4, pages 314–317. IEEE, 2002. 2
- [32] Atsushi Nakazawa and Christian Nitschke. Point of gaze estimation through corneal surface reflection in an active illumination environment. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 159–172. Springer, 2012. 2
- [33] Tadatoshi Ogura, Mizuki Maki, Saki Nagata, and Sanae Nakamura. Dogs (canis familiaris) gaze at our hands: A preliminary eye-tracker experiment on selective attention in dogs. *Animals*, 10(5):755, 2020. 2, 6
- [34] Akshay Rangesh, Bowen Zhang, and Mohan M Trivedi. Driver gaze estimation in the real world: Overcoming the eyeglass challenge. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1054–1059. IEEE, 2020. 3
- [35] Chitwan Saharia, Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Tim Salimans, David J. Fleet, and Mohammad Norouzi. Image super-resolution via iterative refinement, 2021. 1, 3
- [36] Wenzhe Shi, Jose Caballero, Christian Ledig, Xiaohai Zhuang, Wenjia Bai, Kanwal Bhatia, Antonio M Simoes Monteiro de Marvao, Tim Dawes, Declan O’Regan, and Daniel Rueckert. Cardiac image super-resolution with global correspondence using multi-atlas patchmatch. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention—MICCAI 2013: 16th International Conference, Nagoya, Japan, September 22–26, 2013, Proceedings, Part III 16*, pages 9–16. Springer, 2013. 1
- [37] Yusuke Sugano, Yasuyuki Matsushita, and Yoichi Sato. Learning-by-synthesis for appearance-based 3d gaze estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1821–1828, 2014. 2
- [38] Yusuke Sugano, Yasuyuki Matsushita, Yoichi Sato, and Hideki Koike. An incremental learning method for unconstrained gaze estimation. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 656–667. Springer, 2008. 2
- [39] Li Sun, Zicheng Liu, and Ming-Ting Sun. Real time gaze estimation with a consumer depth camera. *Information Sciences*, 320:346–360, 2015. 1, 2
- [40] Yonglong Tian, Chen Sun, Ben Poole, Dilip Krishnan, Cordelia Schmid, and Phillip Isola. What makes for good views for contrastive learning. *CoRR*, abs/2005.10243, 2020. 3
- [41] Radu Timofte, Eirikur Agustsson, Luc Van Gool, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Lei Zhang. Ntire 2017 challenge on single image super-resolution: Methods and results. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 114–125, 2017. 4

- [42] Roberto Valenti, Nicu Sebe, and Theo Gevers. Combining head pose and eye location information for gaze estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 21(2):802–815, 2011. 2
- [43] Xintao Wang, Yu Li, Honglun Zhang, and Ying Shan. Towards real-world blind face restoration with generative facial prior. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9168–9178, 2021. 1, 3, 4
- [44] Xintao Wang, Liangbin Xie, Chao Dong, and Ying Shan. Real-esrgan: Training real-world blind super-resolution with pure synthetic data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1905–1914, 2021. 1, 3
- [45] 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. 1, 3
- [46] Oliver Williams, Andrew Blake, and Roberto Cipolla. Sparse and semi-supervised visual mapping with the s^3 gsp. In *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 1, pages 230–237. IEEE, 2006. 2
- [47] Alexander B Wiltschko, Matthew J Johnson, Giuliano Iurilli, Ralph E Peterson, Jesse M Katon, Stan L Pashkovski, Victoria E Abairra, Ryan P Adams, and Sandeep Robert Datta. Mapping sub-second structure in mouse behavior. *Neuron*, 88(6):1121–1135, 2015. 2, 6
- [48] Xuehan Xiong, Zicheng Liu, Qin Cai, and Zhengyou Zhang. Eye gaze tracking using an rgbd camera: A comparison with a rgb solution. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing: Adjunct Publication*, pages 1113–1121, 2014. 1, 2
- [49] Kai Zhang, Jingyun Liang, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Designing a practical degradation model for deep blind image super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4791–4800, 2021. 3, 4, 5
- [50] Xucong Zhang, Seonwook Park, Thabo Beeler, Derek Bradley, Siyu Tang, and Otmar Hilliges. Eth-xgaze: A large scale dataset for gaze estimation under extreme head pose and gaze variation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 365–381. Springer, 2020. 4, 5
- [51] Xucong Zhang, Yusuke Sugano, Mario Fritz, and Andreas Bulling. Appearance-based gaze estimation in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4511–4520, 2015. 1, 2, 4, 5
- [52] Xucong Zhang, Yusuke Sugano, Mario Fritz, and Andreas Bulling. It’s written all over your face: Full-face appearance-based gaze estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 51–60, 2017. 1, 4, 5
- [53] Xucong Zhang, Yusuke Sugano, Mario Fritz, and Andreas Bulling. Mpii-gaze: Real-world dataset and deep appearance-based gaze estimation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 41(1):162–175, 2017. 2, 5
- [54] Zhiwei Zhu, Qiang Ji, and Kristin P Bennett. Nonlinear eye gaze mapping function estimation via support vector regression. In *18th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR'06)*, volume 1, pages 1132–1135. IEEE, 2006. 2