Uni-ISP: Unifying the Learning of ISPs from Multiple Cameras

Lingen Li Mingde Yao Xingyu Meng Muquan Yu Tianfan Xue Jinwei Gu The Chinese University of Hong Kong

{lgli@link., mingdeyao@, stephenmang@link., mqyu@link., tfxue@ie., jwgu@}cuhk.edu.hk



Figure 1. We propose Uni-ISP, a model that unifies the learning of inverse and forward ISP behaviors of multiple cameras simultaneously. By leveraging the shared characteristics across various camera ISPs, our method can achieve higher performance in inverse and forward ISP (A) compared to previously learned ISP methods tailored for only one camera separately. Meanwhile, the device-aware property of the Uni-ISP enables new cross-camera ISP applications for a learned ISP model, including photographic appearance transfer (B and C), inter/extrapolation (D), and zero-shot image forensics (E and F).

Abstract

Modern end-to-end image signal processors (ISPs) can learn complex mappings from RAW/XYZ data to sRGB (or inverse), opening new possibilities in image processing. However, as the diversity of camera models continues to expand, developing and maintaining individual ISPs is not sustainable in the long term, which inherently lacks versatility, hindering the adaptability to multiple camera models. In this paper, we propose a novel pipeline, Uni-ISP, which unifies the learning of ISPs from multiple cameras, offering an accurate and versatile processor to multiple camera models. The core of Uni-ISP is leveraging deviceaware embeddings through learning inverse/forward ISPs and its special training scheme. By doing so, Uni-ISP not only improves the performance of inverse/forward ISPs but also unlocks a variety of new applications inaccessible to existing learned ISPs. Moreover, since there is no dataset synchronously captured by multiple cameras for training, we construct a real-world 4K dataset, **FiveCam**, comprising more than 2,400 pairs of sRGB-RAW images synchronously captured by five smartphones. We conducted extensive experiments demonstrating Uni-ISP's accuracy in inverse/forward ISPs (with improvements of +1.5dB/2.4dB PSNR), its versatility in enabling new applications, and its adaptability to new camera models.

1. Introduction

Image Signal Processor (ISP) transforms raw image data captured by camera sensors into viewable formats such as sRGB, playing a pivotal role in determining the visual quality of photographs [16]. Through the meticulous design of their ISPs, various camera brands have cultivated distinctive photographic appearances that resonate with diverse user preferences [9, 33]. For example, Apple's smartphone cameras are celebrated for their sharp and distinctive *Apple feel*, while Leica cameras are esteemed for their glow and deep color tones, contributing to the iconic *Leica look*.

Recently, neural networks have been used to approximate the entire ISP or a specific module, aka learned ISP, bringing two main benefits. 1) Performance Enhancement. The powerful representation capabilities of neural networks enable learned ISPs to perform challenging tasks, such as hallucinating detailed content in highlights and shadows [42]. 2) New Functionalities. Learned ISPs introduce new functionalities, such as inverse ISP [1, 38], which converts sRGB images back to RAW/XYZ space, offering greater flexibility and potential for raw-domain enhancement and further manipulation, such as deblurring [22], denoising [3, 5, 32], HDR photography [23, 42], etc. These innovations expand the applications and potential of learned ISPs. However, current methods still design and train ISPs for individual camera models, which might limit the synergistic benefits across different ISPs (see Section 4.1). Moreover, versatile models have shown advantages in various fields in low-level vision [21, 31], high-level vision [19], and multi-modality [35, 39, 41]. As the number of camera models grows, individual learned ISPs may also lack the versatility and adaptability for widespread use, potentially making it unsustainable in the long term.

In this paper, we aim to unify the learning of ISPs from different cameras, which offers two direct advantages. First, it enhances visual quality by leveraging the synergies among ISPs from multiple cameras. Unified learning enables ISPs to understand the underlying commonalities and differences in the diverse data, leading to overall improved visual performance. Second, unified learning provides novel applications, surpassing the capabilities of existing learned ISPs limited to inverse and forward ISPs. The unified learning enables new uses such as photographic appearance transfer, interpolation, and extrapolation across diverse camera models. Additionally, it supports zero-shot image forensics based on the self-consistency of ISP behaviors, including image-level source camera identification and pixel-level image splice detection.

However, learning a device-aware ISP model for multiple cameras is far from trivial, presenting several challenges. First, we observe that simply mixing training data from multiple cameras in current models [1, 18, 38, 40] can not bring satisfactory performances. Therefore, we propose Uni-ISP, a novel unified ISP model for multiple cameras that contains several optimizable device-aware embeddings to learn the ISPs of different cameras. These device-aware embeddings enable the model to capture the specific characteristics tailored to individual devices, while the shared backbones capture underlying commonalities.

Second, current ISP datasets do not contain synchronized sRGB-Raw image pairs captured by multiple cameras. Although this data is not necessary to learn the individual ISP, it is critical for learning a unified ISP that supports synergistic benefits across different camera models and enables the development of new applications. To address this, we develop a synchronized camera array with five smartphones and construct a novel dataset, FiveCam, which consists of 2,464 synchronized high-quality sRGB-Raw paired images with 4K spatial resolution. The captured dataset has a wide range of scenarios, from landscape to close-up, and contains different lighting conditions, including both indoor and outdoor settings during day and night.

Third, given the inevitable misalignment in synchronized photo pairs taken by different cameras, a robust alignment and training scheme is required. To tackle this challenge, we first roughly align the images using optical-flow-based methods, which will introduce frequency bias in wrapped images. Then, we design a frequency bias correction (FBC) loss to mitigate texture blur. Additionally, we introduce the self-/cross-camera training schemes to facilitate applications across the same/different camera models.

With all these three designs, our Uni-ISP can be applied to a wide range of image tasks (Figure 1), such as photographic appearance transfer, interpolation, and extrapolation across diverse camera models. Users can apply the visual characteristics of one camera model to another, achieving unique aesthetic effects. It also facilitates zero-shot image forensics tasks by utilizing the self-consistence of these ISP behaviors, including source camera identification and image splice detection. Extensive experiments show that Uni-ISP outperforms state-of-the-art methods with approximately 1.5dB PSNR in inverse ISP and approximately 2.4dB PSNR in forward ISP.

2. Related Work

Learning Inverse and Forward ISP Training neural networks to learn the inverse and forward processes of certain ISPs has been explored in recent research works [1, 38, 40]. CycleISP [40] maintains the self-contained property of inverse and forward ISP, where the cycle constraints are applied in addition to the independent supervision from the RGB or the raw ground truth. The InvISP [38] achieves the inverse and forward ISP in one self-contained invertible network. However, constraints that ensure the model's invertibility also limit the network's expression ability. ParamISP [18] utilizes the EXIF data in the model design.



Figure 2. The model design of Uni-ISP. Uni-ISP contains two modules, the inverse ISP module g and the forward ISP module h. Both two modules share the same structure. For visual simplicity, we draw the inverse ISP module g as a thumbnail, whose inner structure is the same as the forward ISP module h. The device-aware embeddings are optimizable parameters and will be selected to interact with the bottleneck features via the DEIM during the training or inference.

All existing methods ignore the variance of camera devices, which overlooks the potential value of the commonalities across different camera devices in the learned ISP task. In contrast, our Uni-ISP leverages these underlying commonalities by unifying learning of multiple cameras.

Photorealistic Image Style Transfer Photorealistic image style transfer manipulates the aesthetic of an image, such as its color and tone, without distorting its original structure and content. Non-learning-based photorealistic image style transfer is primarily handled through traditional image processing techniques [27, 29, 30], including color grading [30], gamut optimization [27], etc. Gharbi et al. [13] and Xia et al. [37] propose learning-based bilateral grids for photorealistic image style transfer. The recent large generative models have also opened up new possibilities for photorealistic image style transfer [4, 12, 20, 24], but at a cost of huge computational resources and the risk of distorting the original content. For efficient and high-fidelity photorealistic image style transfer, NeuralPreset [17] is proposed for learning photorealistic image style transfer with a small memory footprint, which can be easily deployed on mobile devices. Unlike the aforementioned methods, our Uni-ISP learns the transfer of style-like visual feeling produced by certain camera ISPs, the photographic appearance, which is device-dependent and physically faithful.

Image Forensics Image forensics focuses on validating and analyzing digital images to determine their origin by source camera identification or authenticity by splice detection. Source camera identification is highly related to the properties of the camera, which can be done by comparing the sensor pattern noise (SPN) and its main component photo response non-uniformity (PRNU) noise of a given image taken with an unknown camera and the reference image taken with known cameras. Lukas et al. [25] extract the photo response non-uniformity (PRNU) using the discrete wavelet transform. Chen et al. [7] propose a residual network for source camera identification. Hui et al. [14] propose a multi-scale feature fusion network and a corresponding two-stage training scheme for this task based on the guidance of PRNU. Some methods are not based on the PRNU but on the lens distortions and auto white balance (AWB) algorithms [2, 10]. Unlike the existing methods that require specific training, our method achieves zeroshot source camera identification by implicitly identifying the whole ISP behavior. Our model can also perform image splice detection by slightly modifying the inference process for source camera identification.

3. Method

3.1. Overview

First, we discuss the XYZ image format of the inverse and forward ISP tasks that our model will undertake. The XYZ images are device-independent measurements of radiances and learning XYZ images enjoys the same benefits as learning raw images. Therefore, in line with [1], we opt for XYZ images processed from the raw images taken by the camera as the raw modality. Specifically, the XYZ image is obtained from the real raw image by applying the early fixed stage of the ISP using the as-shot white balance, a fixed linear demosaicing algorithm, and the camera-to-XYZ matrix of the current device, without applying gamma tone mapping. In this setting, the XYZ images are linearly correlated to the raw images and they can be converted to each other without loss.

Figure 2 shows the overview of Uni-ISP, which contains the inverse ISP module g and forward ISP module h. Our model aims to be aware of various camera devices in the learned ISP tasks. Suppose the images we discussed here are all in size of $H \times W$ and channels of C. Given an sRGB image $I_a \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C}$ produced by the camera $a, \mathcal{E}_a \in \mathbb{R}^D$ represents the device-aware embedding for camera a with size of D, the inverse ISP module g learns to output the corresponding XYZ image \hat{L}_a of camera a given the input I_a :

$$\hat{L}_a = g(I_a, \mathcal{E}_a),\tag{1}$$

and forward ISP module h learns to predict the \hat{I}_a from the real XYZ image L_a :

$$\hat{I}_a = h(L_a, \mathcal{E}_a). \tag{2}$$

The $g(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ learn the inter-device general properties in ISP behaviors, while the device-aware embedding \mathcal{E}_a focuses on device-specific intra-device properties of camera a.

The above formulation allows us to concurrently learn ISP behaviors of multiple cameras $\{a, b, c, ..., z\}$ by training g or h alongside the device-aware embeddings $\{\mathcal{E}_a, \mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_c, ..., \mathcal{E}_z\}$.

3.2. Model Design

As depicted in Figure 2, our Uni-ISP utilizes the inverse ISP module g and forward ISP module h, each featuring an encoder-decoder architecture. Both modules incorporate Local Feature Extraction Blocks (LFEBs) for detailed local processing and Global Feature Manipulation Blocks (GFMBs) for broad image adjustments, mirroring the dual processing dynamics of real camera ISPs that manage both global operations like exposure compensation and color correction, and local tasks such as tone mapping and high-light recovery.

Local Feature Extraction Blocks Each encoder and decoder stage in Uni-ISP comprises four Local Feature Extraction Blocks (LFEBs). LFEBs in the encoder and decoder stages include max-pooling layers and upsampling layers respectively. Each LFEB contains multiple convolutional layers, activation layers, half instance normalization [6], and spatial/channel attention layers. Residual connections link LFEBs across the encoder and decoder stages.

Global Feature Manipulation Blocks Global ISP operations are significantly affected by parameters such as exposure time and ISO, which alter the overall appearance of the photos. Our GFMBs are designed to incorporate these parameters to modify the residual features from the encoder's LFEBs. These manipulated features are then relayed to corresponding LFEBs in the decoder stage. Used camera parameters (exposure, ISO, and f-number) are extracted from the EXIF metadata of JPEG images produced by cameras.



Figure 3. The illustration of frequency bias in dataset wrapped using optical flow method. The interpolation during the wrapping will make images look blurry compared to the original one, eliminating its high-frequency component.

Device-aware Embedding Interaction Module Positioned between the encoder and decoder stages, the Device-aware Embedding Interaction Modules (DEIM) enhance the model's ability to adapt to different camera devices by interacting with device-aware embeddings. Given a device-aware embedding \mathcal{E}_a , the DEIM applies an attention-based transform to the bottleneck features *B* from the encoder stage and output F_a . This setup enables the model to adaptively learn the ISP behaviors of multiple cameras concurrently.

3.3. Training Scheme

We craft a special training scheme for Uni-ISP, which consists of two types of training objectives, i.e., self-camera ISP objective and cross-camera ISP objective.

3.3.1 Self-Camera Training Objective

In the self-camera training objective, our Uni-ISP learns the inverse and forward ISP behavior of multiple cameras simultaneously.

Given a sRGB image I_a and corresponding XYZ image L_a taken with camera a, the inverse ISP training objective is to minimize inverse ISP loss \mathcal{L}_{Inv} , aka the difference between L_a and the predicted \hat{L}_a given in Equation (1):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Inv}} = \|L_a - \hat{L}_a\|_1. \tag{3}$$

The forward ISP training objective requires the model to minimize the following forward ISP loss \mathcal{L}_{For} that calculates differences between the ground truth I_a and the \hat{I}_a given in Equation (2):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{For}} = \|I_a - \hat{I}_a\|_1. \tag{4}$$

3.3.2 Cross-Camera Training Objective

The target photo in the cross-camera training objective is taken by a different camera than the one that captures the input photo. Specifically, this training objective is applied on the forward ISP module h to handle the camera model

transition. Assuming I_a is taken by camera model a and I_b is taken by camera model b, the inverse ISP module g of Uni-ISP takes the I_a as input and predicts the XYZ image \hat{L}_a , which is the same process as the one described in Equation (1). Then the forward ISP module h convert the predicted \hat{L}_a into the sRGB image \hat{I}_b of camera b:

$$\hat{I}_b = h(\hat{L}_a, \mathcal{E}_b),\tag{5}$$

where \mathcal{E}_b indicate the device-aware embeddings of camera b. Here the h takes the \hat{L}_a input as input, which is different from the ground truth L_a used in the self-camera training objective. The cross-camera training objective is defined to minimize the distance between \hat{I}_b and the ground truth I_b .

In the above definition, the input image I_a and the output ground truth I_b can not be aligned since they are captured using different cameras. This makes pixel-level losses like L1-loss fail to drive the cross-camera training objective that minimizes the distance between \hat{I}_b and I_b . Therefore, we first use the optical-flow-based method, RAFT [34], to wrap our dataset for the cross-camera training objective. All sRGB images I_b taken with camera b will be wrapped to be I_b^w , aligned with sRGB images I_a taken with camera a. We apply this wrapping to every possible camera-to-camera sRGB pair in our dataset. Any areas that cannot be aligned will be annotated as occlusion and masked during training.

However, although the optical-flow-based wrapping method effectively aligns these images, it also introduces a frequency bias in our dataset. As demonstrated in Figure 3, the wrapped image tends to have less high-frequency details compared to the image before wrapping. If we use the aligned images to train our model directly, it will unexpectedly learn to smooth the images in the cross-camera ISP tasks.

To tackle this problem, we propose the frequency bias correction (FBC) loss for the cross-camera training objective. The Equation (9) shows the process of this task. The FBC loss can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{FBC} = \|f_{low}(\hat{I}_b) - f_{low}(I_b^w)\|_1 + \mathcal{L}_{Freq}(\hat{I}_b, I_b), \quad (6)$$

where f_{low} is a low-pass filter and \mathcal{L}_{Freq} is a loss in frequency domain. In our implementation, the f_{low} is a Gaussian filter with a kernel size of 5, and we adopt the focal frequency loss [15] as the \mathcal{L}_{Freq} .

Finally, we use the FBC loss \mathcal{L}_{FBC} to drive the crosscamera training. Detailed ablation results on this loss function are presented in Section 4.5.

3.3.3 Overall Loss

In summary, during the training of Uni-ISP, we have three loss terms, the inverse ISP loss \mathcal{L}_{Inv} , the forward ISP loss

 \mathcal{L}_{For} , and the FBC loss \mathcal{L}_{FBC} in total, and an additional regularization term \mathcal{L}_{NRR} :

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Inv}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{For}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{FBC}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{NRR}}, \tag{7}$$

where \mathcal{L}_{NRR} is the additional neutral rendering regularization and λ is the balance weight for it. The neutral rendering regularization guides the model to learn a virtual camera that performs standard color conversion between XYZ and sRGB color space when the device-aware embedding is given as a zero vector \emptyset :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NRR}} = \|s(I_a) - g(I_a, \emptyset)\|_1 + \|s^{-1}(L_a) - h(L_a, \emptyset)\|_1,$$
(8)

where $s(\cdot)$ and $s^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the sRGB-XYZ and XYZ-sRGB color conversion respectively. The neutral rendering regularization adds an anchor for users if they want to enhance or reduce the photographic appearance of a certain camera without inter/extrapolating with the device-ware embedding of another camera.

3.4. Novel Dataset

Although existing sRGB-RAW datasets allow for training models on both inverse and forward ISP tasks, there remains a need for datasets that contain sRGB-RAW pairs captured synchronously by multiple devices. Such datasets are essential for training models to handle cross-camera ISP tasks effectively, which are crucial for applications like photographic appearance transfer and inter/extrapolation.

To address this challenge, we collected a novel dataset named FiveCam, featuring synchronously captured sRGB-RAW pairs from five distinct camera models. This dataset encompasses 2,464 high-resolution (4K) raw and JPEG images representing approximately 500 diverse scenes. Cameras used in the FiveCam dataset include the Apple iPhone 14 Pro Max, Google Pixel 6 Pro, Huawei P40, Samsung Galaxy S20, and Xiaomi Mi 12. All cameras are synchronized using a programmed Bluetooth shutter to ensure consistent timing across all devices.

A preview of the FiveCam dataset, illustrated in Figure 4, showcasing its three scenes alongside the capture devices used. Scenes of our FiveCam dataset are richly varied, capturing both natural landscapes and urban environments under multiple lighting conditions, ranging from broad daylight to nighttime settings, and including both outdoor and indoor illuminance.

Additionally, we have created an sRGB-XYZ version of this dataset, where raw images from all cameras are processed using as-shot white balance, a linear demosaicing algorithm, and converted to the standard camera-to-XYZ color space. The XYZ images in this version retain their linearity, making them particularly beneficial for downstream tasks that require maintaining the raw image's linearity.

This dataset serves dual purposes: as a conventional raw image dataset for learning the inverse and forward ISP,



Figure 4. The preview of 3 scenes in our new dataset (left) and our capture devices (right). Each scene includes synchronized sRGB-Raw pairs of five smartphone cameras: Apple iPhone 14 Pro Max, Google Pixel 6 Pro, Huawei P40, Samsung Galaxy S20, and Xiaomi Mi 12. The raw images are visualized as XYZ images here, which can be converted back to raw without loss.

Table 1. Quantitative results of inverse and forward ISP tasks in the multi-camera mixed test set. All models are trained and tested with data from five different cameras. Please refer to Section 3.4 for detailed model names for each camera. To ensure fairness, the CycleISP [40] is not included in the forward ISP test since it requires ground truth RGB input during the forward ISP process.

Method	Invers	e ISP	Forward ISP	
	PSNR (†)	SSIM (\uparrow)	PSNR (\uparrow)	SSIM (†)
Cycle ISP [40]	28.836	0.8632	-	-
CIE-XYZ Net [1]	24.990	0.7960	22.515	0.8750
InvISP [38]	26.380	0.8042	21.644	0.8625
ParamISP [18]	31.212	0.9180	26.739	0.9182
Uni-ISP (Ours)	32.699	0.9396	29.154	0.9307

and as a specialized resource for training models on crosscamera ISP tasks like photographic appearance transfer and inter/extrapolation. Please refer to the supplementary material provided for more detailed information about this dataset.

4. Applications

In this section, we conduct four experiments to validate Uni-ISP on different applications, including 1) inverse and forward ISP, 2) photographic appearance transfer, 3) photographic appearance inter/extrapolation, and 4) zero-shot source camera forensics. We also conduct ablation studies and analytical experiments to verify the effectiveness of Uni-ISP.

4.1. Inverse and Forward ISP

Settings. We compare Uni-ISP with previous ISP learning methods, including CycleISP [40], CIE-XYZNet [1], InvISP [38], and ParamISP [18]. All methods are retrained on the FiveCam dataset and we train two versions of baseline methods. The first version is trained on the mixed dataset, where sRGB-XYZ image pairs of all five cameras



Figure 5. Two scenes that compare our Uni-ISP with other methods in the task of inverse ISP. The difference maps between the prediction of each model and the ground truth are shown in the second and fourth rows. For better visualization, the XYZ images are adjusted with a 50% increase in brightness to make the content easier to observe.



Figure 6. Two scenes that compare our Uni-ISP with other methods in the task of forward ISP. The CycleISP [40] is not included for a fair comparison since its forward module requires information from the ground truth RGB image.

are used for training. The second version is trained on every single camera separately. Our Uni-ISP only trains a single



Figure 7. Quantitative results of inverse and forward ISP tasks in the single-camera test set. CycleISP [40], CIE-XYZ Net [1], InvISP [38], and ParamISP [18] are trained for each camera model separately while our device-aware Uni-ISP is trained on the mixed dataset. Numbers of total trained parameters for each method in this experiment are noted under the model name in gray. All models are tested with data from a single camera model (name mentioned in the horizontal axis), and the PSNR values are indicated in the vertical axis. For full numeric results in a table, please refer to the supplementary materials.

version on the mixed dataset, with solely the self-camera training objective.

Results. For the first version, we show quantitative results in Table 1, and qualitative results in Figure 5 and Figure 6. By observing the images and difference maps, our Uni-ISP has less error compared to other methods in both two tasks, which is consistent with the numeric results shown in Table 1. For the second version, results in Figure 7 demonstrate our Uni-ISP still outperforms all previous methods when previous methods are trained on a single device separately, i.e., five models for each previous method. In contrast, for our Uni-ISP, we only need to train a single model.

4.2. Photographic Appearance Transfer

Settings. Photographic appearance transfer from camera model a to camera model b can be defined as,

$$I_b = h(g(I_a, \mathcal{E}_a), \mathcal{E}_b), \tag{9}$$

where \mathcal{E}_a and \mathcal{E}_b indicate two distinct device-aware embeddings of two camera models. This process uses inverse module g to inverse the image to XYZ space and then uses forward module h to generate the final image I_b . Given the absence of prior work, we select a series of global and local color transform methods as baselines, including learnable global color transforms, learnable 3D LUTs (Look-Up Tables), learnable bilateral grids, HDRnet [13] and NI-LUT [8]. We input the camera label as the style code within HDRnet and NILUT for a fair comparison. For the first three methods, we train 25 sub-models to accommodate the various transfer mappings required by the 25 possible pairs from the five devices in FiveCam. Still, we only need to train a single Uni-ISP. We adopt PSNR and DISTS [11] for evaluation.

Table 2. Quantitative results of photographic appearance transfer. The best value of each column is highlighted in bold.

Method	$ $ DISTS(\downarrow)	PSNR(†)
Learned Color Matrices	0.1838	20.792
Learned 3D LUTs	0.2027	20.853
Learned Bilateral Grids	0.1971	20.625
HDRnet [13]	0.1722	20.863
NILUT [8]	0.1434	21.390
Uni-ISP (Ours)	0.1392	24.237

Table 3. Source camera identification accuracy of CMIResNet [7], MSFFN [14], and our Uni-ISP.

Method	Accuracy	
CMIResNet [7]	0.3833	
MSFFN [14]	0.4333	
Uni-ISP (Zero-shot)	0.8167	

Results. As shown in Table 2, our method achieves the best results in terms of the two metrics, demonstrating the effectiveness of our method. A visual comparison presented in Figure 8 further illustrates that our Uni-ISP achieves results much closer to the ground truth compared to previous methods like HDRnet and NILUT, indicating the superior performance of our model. Moreover, our model has good temporal stability without a specific design. Figure 9 displays frames from the original iPhone video alongside those transferred to emulate the photographic styles of Google and Xiaomi. Please refer to the supplementary materials for the video.



Figure 8. Comparison among Uni-ISP, HDRnet [13], NILUT [8] in photographic appearance transfer. All three models are asked to transfer the photographic appearance to the camera that takes the ground truth photo. Our Uni-ISP shows more accurate transfer results.



Figure 9. Results of photographic appearance transfer on videos with Uni-ISP. We can see the consistent photographic appearance in the sky, even if our model does not have any temporal-specific design.

4.3. Photographic Appearance Inter/Extrapolation

Settings. In addition to transferring the photographic appearance, Uni-ISP presents the ability to inter/extrapolate the photographic appearance between two cameras smoothly. Given the photo I_a captured by camera a, I_a is firstly inverse to XYZ image by g. Then, the XYZ image is

encoded to be the bottleneck feature and separately interacts with device-aware embeddings \mathcal{E}_a and \mathcal{E}_b , producing intermediate features F_a and F_b right after the DEIM. Then, the manipulated photo I_{a+b} can be obtained by:

$$I_{a+b} = h_{decoder}((1-\alpha)F_a + \alpha F_b), \tag{10}$$

where $h_{decoder}$ is the decoder part of $h, \alpha \in [0, 1]$ is the linear interpolation weight. For extrapolation, we relax the convex combination to the affine combination, where α is not limited in [0, 1].

Results. The results of interpolating and extrapolating photographic appearance are demonstrated in Figure 10. In the first scenario, the Samsung Galaxy S20 prefers a deeper shadow and the extrapolation leads to a more "Samsung" style image. The second scenario is a night scene. Since Apple smartphones are famous for their night photography mode, our model also produces brighter results when we ask the model to be more "Apple", where the lake and the trees become clearer.

4.4. Zero-shot Image Forensics

We perform two forensics tasks: source camera identification and image slice detection, *without* training on these tasks.

4.4.1 Source Camera Identification

Settings During the inference of source camera identification, Uni-ISP performs the inverse and forward ISP tasks



Figure 10. Photographic style interpolation and extrapolation between different camera models. We achieve this by adjusting the coefficient α in Eq. 10. Please refer to the electronic version on a bright display for better visualization.

multiple times with the device-aware embeddings of candidate camera models. Then we measure the edit distance D of each inference, and the predicted camera model is the one that leads to the minimal edit distance. We empirically choose the structural similarity (SSIM) [36] as the metric for evaluating editing distance D. We compare our model with the camera model identification residual neural network (CMIResNet) [7] and the multi-scale feature fusion network (MSFFN) [14]. These methods are trained on the same training set as the Uni-ISP model, whose training objectives are classification tasks on the five cameras. For testing, we collect an extra test set containing 60 sRGB photos taken with the same five cameras in our proposed dataset, but in different scenes.

Results. Table 3 shows the numeric results of the source camera identification experiments on our dataset. Based on these results, our methods show higher accuracy over the classification-based methods for source camera identification, revealing a new possible perspective on this task.

4.4.2 Image Splice Detection

Settings Our Uni-ISP offers additional capability in image splice detection. We can slightly modify its inference process for source camera identification to support image splice detection without extra training. Suppose an image I_a is known to be taken with camera a, but it is altered. We can predict a map to indicate the areas likely to be altered using the self-consistency of inverse and forward ISP learned by Uni-ISP. This can be viewed as a pixel-level task in image forensics. We demonstrate this capability to show the versatility of our Uni-ISP.

Results. Figure 11 demonstrates the example of Uni-ISP's ability in image slice detection, where we put some fake objects on photos taken with iPhone 14 Pro Max. We harmonize the pasted fake objects using Poisson image editing [28]. The detection results are the visualization of the SSIM map, where white areas refer to minor differences, i.e., small editing distance, and darker areas indicate the lo-



Figure 11. Visualization of image slice detection by Uni-ISP. A fake object is integrated into a real photo using Poisson image editing [28], with darker regions in the result indicating suspected modifications.

cation that may not belong to the original photo. The results prove the versatile ability when we unify the learning process of multiple camera ISPs.

4.5. Analysis

Evaluation on HDR Rendering Learning the inverse and forward ISP benefits HDR rendering. To validate the HDR rendering quality with currently learned inverse and forward ISP models, we synthesize multi-exposure raw image stacks with digital gains of [1, 2.6, 4.2] on our test set, render them into sRGB images with a fixed ISP pipeline, and use the exposure fusion to produce the HDR tone-mapped images as ground truths. Given an LDR sRGB image, we adopt models for inverse ISP to convert the LDR sRGB image into an XYZ image. Then, we synthesize a stack of frames with the same digital gains as the dataset and follow the same manner of the dataset to render them into an HDR tone-mapped image.

Figure 12 shows the visualized results and each model's performance in PSNR on the HDR rendering task. Consistent with the inverse ISP performance shown in Table 1, our method also achieves the best quality in the HDR rendering task.



Figure 12. Visualization of the HDR rendering results and the average PSNR on the test set. Thanks to the accuracy in inverse ISP of Uni-ISP, it produces the closest HDR rendering results to the ground truth.



Trained with FBC Loss

Figure 13. Ablation results on the FBC loss. With FBC loss, we effectively avoid our model to learn the frequency bias in our wrapped dataset. The spectrum visualization of the noted patch also demonstrates that the model trained with FBC loss produces a sharper image with stronger high-frequent components.

Ablation Study on FBC Loss We conduct ablation on FBC loss by replacing it with an L1 loss that minimizes differences between model predictions and wrapped images for training. As shown in the image and spectrum visualization of Figure 13, the model trained with FBC loss produces clearer results than the one trained without FBC loss. Numeric results are presented in the supplementary material, which also demonstrates the FBC loss effectively avoids the frequency bias in the wrapped dataset.

Visualization of Internal Features To elucidate why Uni-ISP effectively handles seamless inter/extrapolation of photographic appearances across multiple cameras, we visualize the internal feature distributions of our model. Specifically, we execute both self-camera tasks (inverse and forward ISP) and cross-camera tasks (photographic appearance transfer) using our test set. During these tests, we capture the forward ISP module h's intermediate bottleneck features B before they are processed by the DEIM and F_x for each camera $x \in \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ after they are processed by the DEIM. Here, $x \in \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ denotes the variable for the five cameras in our new dataset. The location of Band F_x are noted in Figure 2. We utilize UMAP [26] to project these high-dimensional features into a 2D space, as shown in Figure 14. This visualization clearly delineates the transformation dynamics of features, with distinct clusters emerging for each camera model. This clustering visually confirms that the process of interpolating or extrapolating photographic appearances mimics sampling from a well-defined manifold of camera ISP behaviors. Thanks to the DEIM, which transforms features from an indistinct subspace (points noted by triangles) into a clearly delineable manifold (points noted by circles and squares), our model facilitates smooth inter/extrapolation between the photographic appearances of different camera models, as depicted in Figure 10.



Figure 14. UMAP visualization of the internal features B right before the DEIM and internal features F_x ($x \in \{a, b, c, d, e\}$) right after the DEIM inside the forward ISP module h of Uni-ISP. The DEIM lets corresponding device-aware embeddings \mathcal{E}_x interact with the bottleneck features produced by the encoder stage of forward ISP module ($h_{encoder}$), then produce the F_x . Features F_x lie in a special manifold, where features in both self-camera and cross-camera tasks with the same target camera models are clustered together.

Few-shot Extension Ability Given a few sRGB-Raw samples of an unseen camera, our Uni-ISP has the extension ability to perform well in inverse and forward ISP learning

of that new camera by only training a new device-aware embedding while keeping the rest of the model frozen. We conduct the few-shot extension experiments on the S7 ISP dataset [32] to validate the few-shot extension ability of Uni-ISP. During training, we load the weights of the previously trained model in Section 4.1 and only optimize the newly created device-aware embedding for this unseen camera, Samsung Galaxy S7. For comparison, we select the ParamISP [18] since it outperforms previous methods in most cases. To simulate the scenario where only limited training data is available, we randomly select 10 scenes of the whole S7 dataset for training and the other 100 scenes for testing the generalizability. All models are trained for 50 epochs for convergence. Tests are conducted on the checkpoint of the 50th epoch. Table 4 shows the results of fewshot extension experiments with only 10 samples for learning this unseen camera model's inverse and forward ISP.

As we can see, our Uni-ISP outperforms the ParamISP [18] in forward ISP when only 10 training samples are provided, which demonstrates the value of this extension ability in extreme scenarios of lacking adequate training datasets.

Table 4. Few-shot extension experiments on S7 ISP dataset [32] with only 10 samples for learning this unseen camera model's inverse and forward ISP. We compare performances of the extension version of Uni-ISP (*Uni-ISP-Ext*) with the trained-from-scratch version of ParamISP [18] since the ParamISP outperforms other prior models in most cases. Numbers of trained parameters are given in the *Param.* column. The best performance for each few-shot sample scenario is noted in **bold**.

Method	Param.	Inverse ISP		Forward ISP	
		PSNR (†)	SSIM (†)	PSNR (†)	SSIM (\uparrow)
ParamISP	700K	23.907	0.8305	21.439	0.8489
Uni-ISP-Ext	256	25.307	0.8597	22.798	0.8590

5. Conclusion

In this study, we presented the Uni-ISP, which can concurrently learn inverse and forward ISP behaviors of multiple cameras. The Uni-ISP harnesses the commonalities and distinctions across different cameras, enhancing the performance of ISP tasks beyond that of models trained on singlecamera or mixed datasets. Additionally, Uni-ISP introduces novel applications for learned ISPs, including photographic appearance editing and zero-shot camera source forensics.

In future work, we plan to explore the interaction between the device-specific components and the backbone network by introducing more domain knowledge from ISP designs. Furthermore, considering the complexity of inverse ISP tasks, which can often be highly ill-posed, investigating the use of generative priors to maintain image fidelity presents an intriguing avenue for future research.

References

- Mahmoud Afifi, Abdelrahman Abdelhamed, Abdullah Abuolaim, Abhijith Punnappurath, and Michael S Brown. Cie xyz net: Unprocessing images for low-level computer vision tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(9):4688–4700, 2021. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [2] Luca Bondi, Luca Baroffio, David Güera, Paolo Bestagini, Edward J Delp, and Stefano Tubaro. First steps toward camera model identification with convolutional neural networks. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 24(3):259–263, 2016. 3
- [3] Tim Brooks, Ben Mildenhall, Tianfan Xue, Jiawen Chen, Dillon Sharlet, and Jonathan T Barron. Unprocessing images for learned raw denoising. In *IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 11036–11045, 2019. 2
- [4] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 18392– 18402, 2023. 3
- [5] Chen Chen, Qifeng Chen, Jia Xu, and Vladlen Koltun. Learning to see in the dark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3291–3300, 2018. 2
- [6] Liangyu Chen, Xin Lu, Jie Zhang, Xiaojie Chu, and Chengpeng Chen. Hinet: Half instance normalization network for image restoration. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 182–192, 2021. 4
- [7] Yunshu Chen, Yue Huang, and Xinghao Ding. Camera model identification with residual neural network. In 2017 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP), pages 4337–4341. IEEE, 2017. 3, 7, 9
- [8] Marcos V Conde, Javier Vazquez-Corral, Michael S Brown, and Radu Timofte. Nilut: Conditional neural implicit 3d lookup tables for image enhancement. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1371– 1379, 2024. 7, 8
- [9] Yubin Deng, Chen Change Loy, and Xiaoou Tang. Image aesthetic assessment: An experimental survey. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 34(4):80–106, 2017. 2
- [10] Zhonghai Deng, Arjan Gijsenij, and Jingyuan Zhang. Source camera identification using auto-white balance approximation. In 2011 international conference on computer vision, pages 57–64. IEEE, 2011. 3
- [11] Keyan Ding, Kede Ma, Shiqi Wang, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: Unifying structure and texture similarity. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 44(5): 2567–2581, 2020. 7
- [12] Tsu-Jui Fu, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. Language-driven artistic style transfer. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 717–734. Springer, 2022.
 3
- [13] Michaël Gharbi, Jiawen Chen, Jonathan T Barron, Samuel W Hasinoff, and Frédo Durand. Deep bilateral learning for realtime image enhancement. ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG), 36(4):1–12, 2017. 3, 7, 8
- [14] Chen Hui, Feng Jiang, Shaohui Liu, and Debin Zhao. Source camera identification with multi-scale feature fusion net-

work. In 2022 IEEE international conference on multimedia and Expo (ICME), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022. 3, 7, 9

- [15] Liming Jiang, Bo Dai, Wayne Wu, and Chen Change Loy. Focal frequency loss for image reconstruction and synthesis. In *Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, pages 13919–13929, 2021. 5
- [16] Hakki Can Karaimer and Michael S Brown. A software platform for manipulating the camera imaging pipeline. In Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14, pages 429–444. Springer, 2016. 2
- [17] Zhanghan Ke, Yuhao Liu, Lei Zhu, Nanxuan Zhao, and Rynson WH Lau. Neural preset for color style transfer. In *IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 14173– 14182, 2023. 3
- [18] Woohyeok Kim, Geonu Kim, Junyong Lee, Seungyong Lee, Seung-Hwan Baek, and Sunghyun Cho. Paramisp: Learned forward and inverse isps using camera parameters. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2312.13313, 2023. 2, 6, 7, 11
- [19] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 2
- [20] Gihyun Kwon and Jong Chul Ye. Clipstyler: Image style transfer with a single text condition. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 18062–18071, 2022. 3
- [21] Boyun Li, Xiao Liu, Peng Hu, Zhongqin Wu, Jiancheng Lv, and Xi Peng. All-in-one image restoration for unknown corruption. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference* on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 17452– 17462, 2022. 2
- [22] Chih-Hung Liang, Yu-An Chen, Yueh-Cheng Liu, and Winston H Hsu. Raw image deblurring. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 24:61–72, 2020. 2
- [23] Yu-Lun Liu, Wei-Sheng Lai, Yu-Sheng Chen, Yi-Lung Kao, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Yung-Yu Chuang, and Jia-Bin Huang. Single-image hdr reconstruction by learning to reverse the camera pipeline. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1651–1660, 2020. 2
- [24] Zhi-Song Liu, Li-Wen Wang, Wan-Chi Siu, and Vicky Kalogeiton. Name your style: Text-guided artistic style transfer. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 3529–3533, 2023. 3
- [25] Jan Lukas, Jessica Fridrich, and Miroslav Goljan. Digital camera identification from sensor pattern noise. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 1(2): 205–214, 2006. 3
- [26] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426, 2018. 11
- [27] Rang MH Nguyen, Seon Joo Kim, and Michael S Brown. Illuminant aware gamut-based color transfer. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, pages 319–328. Wiley Online Library, 2014. 3

- [28] Patrick Pérez, Michel Gangnet, and Andrew Blake. Poisson image editing. In *Seminal Graphics Papers: Pushing the Boundaries, Volume 2*, pages 577–582. 2023. 9, 10
- [29] Francois Pitie, Anil C Kokaram, and Rozenn Dahyot. Ndimensional probability density function transfer and its application to color transfer. In *Tenth IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV'05) Volume 1*, pages 1434–1439. IEEE, 2005. 3
- [30] François Pitié, Anil C Kokaram, and Rozenn Dahyot. Automated colour grading using colour distribution transfer. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 107(1-2):123– 137, 2007. 3
- [31] Vaishnav Potlapalli, Syed Waqas Zamir, Salman H Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Promptir: Prompting for all-inone image restoration. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024. 2
- [32] Eli Schwartz, Raja Giryes, and Alex M Bronstein. Deepisp: Toward learning an end-to-end image processing pipeline. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 28(2):912–923, 2018. 2, 11
- [33] Matheus Souza and Wolfgang Heidrich. Metaisp–exploiting global scene structure for accurate multi-device color rendition. 2023. 2
- [34] Zachary Teed and Jia Deng. Raft: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow. In *Computer Vision–ECCV* 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23– 28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16, pages 402–419. Springer, 2020. 5
- [35] Jinpeng Wang, Yixiao Ge, Rui Yan, Yuying Ge, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Satoshi Tsutsui, Xudong Lin, Guanyu Cai, Jianping Wu, Ying Shan, et al. All in one: Exploring unified video-language pre-training. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 6598–6608, 2023. 2
- [36] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 13(4): 600–612, 2004. 9
- [37] Xide Xia, Meng Zhang, Tianfan Xue, Zheng Sun, Hui Fang, Brian Kulis, and Jiawen Chen. Joint bilateral learning for real-time universal photorealistic style transfer. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VIII 16*, pages 327–342. Springer, 2020. 3
- [38] Yazhou Xing, Zian Qian, and Qifeng Chen. Invertible image signal processing. In *IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 6287–6296, 2021. 2, 6, 7
- [39] Xingqian Xu, Zhangyang Wang, Gong Zhang, Kai Wang, and Humphrey Shi. Versatile diffusion: Text, images and variations all in one diffusion model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7754–7765, 2023. 2
- [40] Syed Waqas Zamir, Aditya Arora, Salman Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Ling Shao. Cycleisp: Real image restoration via improved data synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2696–2705, 2020. 2, 6, 7

- [41] Yan Zeng, Xinsong Zhang, Hang Li, Jiawei Wang, Jipeng Zhang, and Wangchunshu Zhou. X 2-vlm: All-in-one pretrained model for vision-language tasks. *IEEE Transactions* on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 2023. 2
- [42] Yunhao Zou, Chenggang Yan, and Ying Fu. Rawhdr: High dynamic range image reconstruction from a single raw image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 12334–12344, 2023. 2