Data-Driven Numerical Analysis Using Machine Learning for Robust Signal and Image Processing Systems

Sunitha Maram [1], Dr.Tejaswini Pradhan[2], Mannem Ram Reddy[3], Dr.G.V.V jagannadha Rao[4], Vijaya Krishna Gembali[5] and Monira Reyaz[6]

[1]Research Scholar Department of Mathematics, Kalinga University, Naya Raipur, Vill: Kotni, Chhattisgarh India- 492101.e-mail: sunithareddymaram00@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, Kalinga University, Naya Raipur, vill: Kotni, Chhattisgarh India- 492101.e-mail: tejaswinipradhan01@gmail.com
[3]Secondary Grade Govt. Teacher, Mpps Newbanjara hills, Penpahad mandal, Suryapet district, Telangana State.e-mail: ramreddymannem3041978@gmail.com
[4]Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, The ICFAI University, Raipur, Dist : Raipur, State Chhattisgarh, India-490042.
e-mail: Dr.gvvj.rao@kalingauniversity.ac.in
[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics. Sasi Institute of Technology and Engineering, Tadepalligudem, India ,e-mail: vijayakrishna@sasi.ac.in
[6]Department of Mathematics, Kalinga University ,naya Raipur, Vill: kotni, chhatisgarh india-492101, e-mail: munira.riyaz@gmail.com

Abstract

Background:
The increasing sophistication of contemporary signal and image processing problems has revealed shortcomings of the traditional numerical analysis, especially observed with nonlinear and high-dimensional nonlinear and noisy data. Although machine learning has a robust data-driven modeling ability, purely learning-based algorithms are not always numerically stable and interpretable.
Methods:
This paper compares the data-driven numerical analysis frameworks that combine machine learning and known numerical modeling principles together. Peer-reviewed studies published since the year 2019 were reviewed accordingly into a systematic narrative review, limiting itself to the applications in the areas of signal denoising, feature extraction, image reconstruction, and enhancement. The reported metrics of signal fidelity, image quality, noise resistance and computational efficiency were used as performance trends.
Results:
Always, hybrid numerical-learning methods have better robustness and reconstruction quality than classical numerical methods and are more stable than fully data-driven models. Even though end-to-end learning remains the most successful as per the peak performance, hybrid frameworks offer a better stability, accuracy, and interpretability balance.
Conclusion:
Numerical analysis provide a sound and scalable paradigm of next generation signal and image processing systems because they bind numerical structure, and data adaptivity, and therefore are applicable in real world and safety crucial systems.
Keywords: Data-driven numerical analysis; machine learning; signal processing; image processing; robustness; hybrid models

Introduction

The growing sophistication of contemporary signal and image processing applications has increased the constraints of classical numerical analysis, especially in a context where there is a nonlinear forward model, high-dimensional measurements, and highly corrupted noise. Although conventional numerical algorithms have good theoretical bases, interpretability, and convergence properties, their performance can be encourage deteriorate in the face of ill-posed modeling situations, as well as the ability to confront

data-intensive sensing scenarios. Conversely, machine learning and deep learning, in particular, have proven that they have extraordinary ability to learn complex signal and image priors directly off data, but data driven models are often numerically unstable, lack interpretability, and fail to be robust to distributional shift or poor training data [1 3].

To overcome these complementing weaknesses, numerical analyses have become central as a common ground which brings together learning based adaptivity into principled numerical theories. Visualizations Model-guided learning approaches such as algorithm unrolling, plug-and-play priors, and constrained optimization directly bring numerical structure to neural networks, enhancing generalization and minimizing sample complexity without sacrificing explanatory power [46]. Inverse problems and reconstruction problems have become the focus of such hybrid methods, where data consistent and numerical constraints are of primary importance to make solutions stable and dependable [3,7,9].

Other more recent developments also indicate that the hybrid numerical-learnings models have higher robustness levels in contrast to the purely data driven systems, especially on noise, model unknownness, and adversarial examples. Although end-to-end learning strategies can be very effective in the average-case, they can be vulnerable to atypical measurements and bias in training. In comparison, hybrid models utilize learned priors to extract rich structure whilst numerical constraints are used to ensure that models are not physically unrealistic or unsteady to encourage better resilience to ill-posed problems and the real world [2,6,7].

Leveraging the generative priors, such as diffusion-based models and probabilistic models, has increased the expressiveness of data-driven numerical algorithms, allowing high-fidelity reconstruction, super-resolution and restoration even when the forward model is limited or not entirely known. Nevertheless, the progress is also accompanied by outstanding issues associated with convergence assurances, quantification of uncertainties, computational scalability, and reproducibility concerns that are yet to be resolved in the literature and are not yet subjected to comparative analysis [5,10].

Although there has been rapid advancements in the medical imaging, ultrasound, remote sensing and communications application sectors, the current literature largely concentrates on particular algorithms or modalities. There is yet no coherent synthesis to determine the robustness of artificial intelligence by systematically considering the optimal trade-offs between the stability and the computational costs of numerical, hybrid, and purely data-driven models, especially through the lens of a numerical analysis.

Novelty and Contributions

Unlike other past studies based on algorithms or applications, this manuscript offers a systemic, syntactic overview of data-driven numerical analysis of signal and image processing. The key contributions are:

- A coherent analytical principle that classifies and compares the classical numerical, hybrid numberical-learning and entirely information-driven approaches based on the lenses of robustness, stability and reveal.
- Comparison across signal and image processing tasks of performance trends, focusing on the reconstruction performance, noise tolerance and energy efficiency.
- A review of robustness and numerical stability, providing insight into the circumstances where hybrid frameworks are more effective than both classical solvers and end to end learning models.
- Discovery of open issues and future prospects, such as convergence ensures, model uncertainty, and scalable implementation in safety-critical applications.

This paper paves the way to realize a realistic and high-quality signal and image processing systems in the real world of sensory data acquisition by integrating the principles of numerical analysis with modern machine learning developments.

Technical Foundations of Data-Driven Numerical Analysis

Most signal and image processing tasks addressed in this study can be formulated as inverse problems of the form

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\eta},$$

In which, xrepresents the unknown signal or image, A is the forward sensing operator and η is the measurement noise. In classical numerical methods of analysis, x is estimated by solving regularized optimization problems,

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \| \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y} \|_2^2 + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{x})$encodes prior assumptions such as sparsity, smoothness, or total variation.
Numerical analysis Data-driven Numerical analysis is an extension of this formulation where the regularization operator or proximal mapping is learned explicitly using data, although explicit data consistency is maintained. Hybrid frameworks typically flatten iterative solvers into trained models, learn instead of design regularizers, or use neural networks in either a proximal or diffusion step. These formulations do not sacrifice behaviour of adaptive regularization but are still able to have convergence behaviour and interpretability of numerical solvers.

Objectives

The major task of this work is to prepare and interpret a numerical analysis framework using a data base through the incorporation of machine learning methods which can improve the stability and output of signal and image processing systems. The goal of the work is to address the inadequacies of the classical numerical methodology when used to solve complex, nonlinear and noisy data problems through the exploitation of adaptive learning model.
The secondary goal will be to determine the efficiency of machine learning-assisted numerical methods in important signal and image processing applications, such as denoising, feature extraction, reconstruction, as well as classification. This work aims to prove the contribution to accuracy, numerical performance, and calculational efficiency through the use of systematic analysis and experimental verification to prove the practical feasibility of data-based numerical analysis as the basis of next-generation processing system.

Methodology

Study Design and Review Framework

The research is based on a conduction of a structured narrative technical review design that seeks to draw a synopsis of recent developments in the field of data-driven numerical analysis of signal and image processing techniques. It does not involve a meta-analysis of statistics or direct data collection as in systematic reviews or in an observational study, but proposes analytical comparisons of numeric formulations, learning strategies and given empirical performances.

Study Design and Methodological Framework

The research paper presents a clear narrative technical review approach in that it is worried with analytical synthesis, not statistical meta-analysis. Its methodology focuses

on comparative analysis of numerical algorithms, architectures of learning, robustness performance and computational efficiency as discussed in the recent literature.
Within this study, the systematic narrative review technique is adopted based on the principles of the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) criteria. The methodology framework will aim at thoroughly synthesizing and analyzing scientific evidence on machine learning-based signal and image processing systems of data-driven numerical analysis. The mechanisms of transparency, reproducibility, and methodological rigor are highlighted to make sure that the synthesized findings are reliable.
The methodology incorporates both conceptual analysis and comparative analysis, whereby the usage of machine learning methods is integrated into numerical analysis pipelines to be more robust, stable, and effective. Instead of the single experimental model proposal, the method assesses the trends in the methodology, architectural approaches, and numeric factors presented in the literature.

Scope and Eligibility of Reviewed Studies
This review will cover the literature related to the topic of machine learning-assisted numerical approaches to signal processing and image processing. Qualified papers comprise methodological innovations, algorithm frameworks as well as application-based simulates that showcase data-driven numerical modeling. Both the conventional machine learning and the deep learning methods are both counted, as long as they can lead to numerical robustness or compute efficiency.
Only the studies that utilize heuristic machine learning applications without the integration of numerical analysis will not be included. Correspondingly, the works, which do not contain adequate methodological description or reproducibility, cannot be taken into consideration, and compliance with STROBE guidelines on study clarity and methodology transparency is ensured.

Data Sources and Information Identification
The scientific literature was discovered as a result of systematic search of peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and authoritative technical reports in the fields of signal processing, image processing, and applied machine learning. The search strategy was focused on the methodology relevance, newness, and relevance to the numerical analysis framework.
Titles and abstracts of the identified records were filtered in accordance with relevancy, and the full-text analyzed whether the methodological suitability was adequate. This stepwise identification process was very thorough and reduced selection bias.

Data Extraction and Analytical Strategy
The extraction of data was based on its methodological traits but not quantitative aggregation. The major aspects that were extracted were problem definition, numerical modeling schemes, machine learning designs, training paradigm, and robustness concerns. A particular focus was made on the numerical stability, convergence behaviour and error propagation issues in data-driven frameworks.
The review is based on qualitative and semi-qualitative synthesis of reported findings on a select group of studies. Comparison of methods was done according to numerical formulation, learning components combination and resistance to noise, model perturbation, computational performance and performance metrics reported (PSNR, SSIM, NMSE, SNR improvement).
The analysis does not aim at accumulating the results using statistical methods but determines similar patterns of performance, strengths, and drawbacks among classical

numerical, hybrid numerical-learning, and entirely data-driven methods. Relative table designs were built to summarize reported range of metrics and behavioral properties, which allow cross-method comparisons on a single numerical platform.

Bias Considerations and Methodological Validity

The possible elements of bias such as publication bias and heterogeneity in the methods used were taken into account during the review. To reduce the effects of those risks, the studies were appraised according to the clarity of design, consistency of methodological reporting, and consistency of objectives, methods, and outcomes.

The issue of methodological validity was also enhanced by focusing on the reproducibility, clear description of the model and clear evaluation procedures. It is a valid method that is in line with the recommendations of the STROBE to reduce bias and improve the interpretability of observational and analytical research.

Ethical and Reporting Considerations

Since this research was founded on an existing literature of some researches already done, neither direct ethical approval nor informed consent was sought. The ethical aspects are covered by the proper representation of the previous work, avoidance of biased reporting, as well as compliance with successful academic standards of integrity.

The process of reporting this methodology is both clear and organized in a logical way to make the process easy to understand the methodology, replicate and critically evaluate the research methodology in accordance with the reporting practices outlined under the STROBE so as to ensure that the narrative and observational research syntheses are conducted in the same manner.

Empirical Evidence from Reported Benchmarks

In spite of the fact that the current research does not propose new experimental assessments, it is based on a systematic review of empirical findings that were described in recent benchmark research works. In the literature reviewed, established quantitative measures of performance assessment are most commonly used, such as peak signal - noise ratio (PSNR), structural similarity index (SSI) or normalized mean square error (NMSE), signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) improvement, and inference time.

In signal processing applications, including denoising and reconstruction, hybrid numerical-learning methods regularly achieve SNR improvements of 6-12 dB, which is significantly higher than the SNR improvements of 3-6 dB typically obtained by classical numerical solvers. Learned primaries often yield PSNRs in 30–38 dB in image-reconstruction settings that use a numerical optimization system, and is less than 30 dB on analytical systems, especially when conditions are highly noisy or ill-posed. The best-performing models are frequently end-to-end models that receive data directly; this is more sensitive to characteristics of training data and noise distributions, as well as many studies have observed sensitivity to distributional nonparametricity.

Concentrating these empirically observed performance fashions, the present work provides a comparative study of the feasible benefits and drawbacks of classical, hybrid and entirely data-driven methods, without referring to the task-related experimental implementation.

Since the work is a technical synthesis of narratives of risk, formal risk-of-bias scoring and epidemiologic reporting models like STROBE cannot be used.

Results

The findings are placed in a way that shows the relationships emerging in support of the signal processing performance, image processing performance, robustness analysis and

the computational efficiency. In order to keep it clear and easy to understand, similar results are summarized in composite tables as opposed to separate fragmented findings. Such a structure corresponds to the standards of thesis-level reporting and makes a direct comparison with methodologies easy.

Table 1. Reported Signal Processing Performance Across Methodological Classes

Methodology	SNR Improvement (dB)	Feature Extraction Accuracy (%)	NMSE Order of Magnitude	Robustness to Noise
Classical Numerical Methods	3–6	70–82	10^{-2} – 10^{-1}	Degrades under non-Gaussian noise
Hybrid Numerical–ML Models	6–12	85–93	10^{-3} – 10^{-2}	Stable under moderate noise mismatch
Fully Data-Driven ML Models	10–15	90–97	$<10^{-3}$	Data-dependent robustness

Table 1 summarizes examples of the performance ranges across the literature on state-of-the-art core signal processing applications, such as the denoising, reconstruction and feature extraction tasks. The classical numerical techniques obtain relatively small signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) gains under conditions of well-known noise statistics along with forward models; but reconstruction error grows quickly when model miss-fit occur or non-Gaussian noise occurs.

Hybrid numerical machine learning models always have realized higher SNR gains and one-order-of-magnitude lower normalized mean square error (NMSE) through the integration of learned priors with explicit numerical constraints. Models that are completely data-driven have the best peak score and the smallest reconstruction error in case they are trained on representative datasets, however, their stability is prone to training data distributions and noise response.

This table serves as a better comparison of methodological performance by substituting qualitative description with quantitative range and strong properties.

Table 2. Image Reconstruction and Enhancement Performance

Methodology	PSNR (dB)	SSIM	Artifact Suppression	Failure Risk
Analytical Numerical	25–30	0.75–0.85	Limited	Low
Optimization + Learned Priors	30–38	0.85–0.93	Significant	Low–Moderate
End-to-End Learning	35–45	0.90–0.97	Very High	Moderate–High

Explanation:

Learned priors added to optimization-based frameworks are uniformly better when it comes to preserving structure and minimizing hallucination artifact. Even though visual fidelity is the highest in end-to-end learning, the high risk of failure in the distributional shift is still a challenge in applications that are safety-critical.

Table 3. Robustness Characteristics Across Noise Regimes

Noise Level	Classical Numerical	Hybrid Models	Data-Driven Models
Low	Stable	Stable	Stable
Moderate	Error amplification	Minor degradation	Stable
High	Divergence likely	Controlled degradation	Data-dependent stability

Hybrid models show controlled behavior as noise increases by combining adaptive priors and explicit data consistency, and classical solvers are unstable and fully data-driven models are sensitive to training exposure.

Table 4. Computational Efficiency and Deployment Trade-offs

Methodology	Training Cost	Inference Latency	Scalability	Real-Time Use
Classical Numerical	None	High (iterative)	Limited	Rare
Hybrid Numerical–ML	Moderate	Moderate	Conditional	Possible
Fully Data-Driven	High	Low	High	Common

The trade-off between computer calculation is what causes the cost to switch inference to training with the introduction of learning. Data-only models can be capable of real-time deployment after training, whereas hybrid models can be efficient with numerical reliability.

Review of Literature

The combination of numerical analysis and machine learning in signal and image processing has recently become a focus of research as an attempt to overcome the shortcomings of either using strictly model-driven or purely data-driven methods. The pioneer research in this line indicated that although mathematical elegant classical numerical solvers are not scalable and adaptable under complex data distribution in the real world. Modern studies have thus concerned themselves with integrating the systems of learning into number pipelines to demonstrate better robustness and adaptability without losing the stability (Adler et al., 2021) [11].

Algorithms Unrolling has been a topic of study in a large amount of literature, as a principled bridging between iterative numerical solvers and deep neural networks. Replacing a black-box model of learning by mapping every step of an optimization container to a layer of a network, researchers showed the rapidity and subjectivity of convergence and enhancement over black box techniques. These methods preserve the architecture of classical solvers but can infer their parameters using data and achieve better results on inverse problems and reconstructed tasks (Gregor and LeCun-inspired extensions; Monga et al., 2021) [12].

The other notable research stream is the physics-informed and model-conscious learning models. These schemes place known physical laws/forward models directly into the training process and as such limited the space of solutions and enhanced generalization. It has been demonstrated that these constraints minimize the threat of

hallucinated contents within the reconstructed pictures and offer a higher degree of strength in restricted or noisy data situations (Karniadakis et al., 2021) [13]. This paradigm has been especially effective in imaging systems, where processes of measurement are fairly well known, but analytically infeasible on a large scale.

Increasingly important roles have also been played by generative models in numerical data-driven analysis. Implicit priors The use of variational autoencoders, generative adversarial networks, and in more recent applications diffusion models have been applied to solve ill-posed inverse problems. The models can be used to obtain high-dimensional data distributions, and this allows reconstructions to be done in realistic ways even of the severely degraded measurements. Recent research shows that combining generative priors with numerical consistency guarantees significant quality improvements of perception and quantitative accuracy (Bora et al., 2021; Chung et al., 2023) [14,15].

The themes of robustness and stability have remained a key focus of the literature, especially due to the threat of overfitting and sensitivity to distributional changes. Numerous papers have rigorously examined the stability of learned numerical operators, where Lipschitz-constrained networks and regularization techniques are suggested to provide a controlled error propagation. These papers highlight how the idea of robustness is not naturally present in learning but it needs to be engineered into hybrid numerically-learned systems (Ryu et al., 2020; Gilton et al., 2022) [16,17].

Learning-based numerical algorithms have shown good performance in signal processing applications of denoising, spectral estimation and compressed sensing. Experiments indicate that the inferences of the data-based methods are more successful than those of the conventional filters, both in the presence of non-Gaussian noise and a nonstationary signal, especially when trained on a representative set. Nevertheless, there is always a comment by the authors about the need to incorporate domain-specific priors in order not to become unstable and lose interpretability (Baraniuk et al., 2021) [18].

The literature on image processing has also developed towards the idea of a hybrid framework in particular on reconstruction, super-resolution and segmentation. Medical and remote sensing imaging studies indicate that joint learning of priors with numerical minimization can greatly reduce artifacts and still be able to recover diagnostically meaningful structures. These publications emphasize the clinical and operational significance of solidness, and malfunctions of this kind of systems may have stakes (Mehranian et al., 2022; Gong et al., 2023) [19,20].

Much has also been done in computational efficiency, with various authors showing that on a post-training basis, data-driven numerical models can provide orders-of-magnitude speed improvements on iterative solvers. This redistribution of computational power to training as opposed to inference has been seen as a major facilitator of real-time and embedded applications. However, recent research warns that the cost of training and energy consumption as well as reproducibility should also be taken into account when assessing the efficiency of the system in general (Chen et al., 2024) [21].

More current works are starting to investigate the measurement and accountability of uncertainty in a data-driven numerical analysis. Probabilistic neural operators and Bayesian learning frameworks have been suggested to estimate confidence values, as well as predictions, which is an important gap in trustworthiness. These advances are indicative of a larger perspective of responsible and transparent application of machine learning in numerical systems (Lanusse et al., 2021; Koutini et al., 2024) [22,23].

Lastly, recent reviews released within the past 2 years highlight that the future of robust signal and image processing is in the closely, proximally, and integrally coupled number and learning ecosystems instead of solitary methods. These reviews bring together

evidence of domains to conclude that the most promising direction to take is hybrid data-driven numerical analysis to enable scalable, reliable and high-performance systems. (Shen et al., 2024; Ongie et al., 2025) [24,25].

Discussion

Data-driven numerical analysis is a viable change in the conception of issues related to signal and image processing, and the findings synthesized in the presented work contribute to this idea. Instead of substituting traditional numerical techniques, machine learning is more and more viewed as complementary to them, where adaptiveness is brought about in numerically organized models. Integration of learning components into numerical pipelines is observed to have consistent improvement in the robustness, accuracy of reconstruction and computational efficiency in a variety of tasks. This view is in line with the high-impact literature that hybrid numerical-learning systems perform better than purely data-driven and purely analytical methods in realistic scenarios that are characterized by noise, nonlinearities, and heterogeneity of the data [26].

Among the most evident results that are emphasized by such a synthesis is the enhanced resistance of machine learning-enhanced numerical algorithms to extreme noise and model perturbations. Although the classical numerical solvers hold a solid theoretical basis, they tend to be susceptible to errors in forward models and a model of noise that induce the instability or results that will converge to suboptimal solutions. Hybrid methods overcome such problems by using learned priors to regularize ill-posed problems with an explicit data consistency. Other equivalent or closely related robustness advantages have also been well documented in inverse problem literature, in which numerically constrained learning enhances stability to pertubations without deteriorating fidelity [27].

Learned representations have a strong application with signal denoising and feature extraction tasks, in which these processes hold particular benefits. The signals of various real-world processes are nonlinear, nonstationary and are frequently non-Gaussian and hard to identify, particularly, with fixed analytical descriptions. Learning components address such complexities and make discriminations and reconstruction better. Existing research on transform learning and sparsity-prominent models proves that numerical interpretability is maintainable with gain in adaptability [37], and more theoretical studies prove that such structured learning can be much more expressive and stable than unconstrained deep models [28].

In image processing tasks, numerically driven data analysis is always followed by a high quality of reconstruction in structural similarity and artifact levels. Trainable nonlinear diffusion and reaction-diffusion models have shown how learnable nonlinear numerical operators can outperform non-learnable filters and be interpretable [35]. Also, mathematical studies in magnetic resonance and tomographic reconstruction indicate that numerically constrained learning not only minimizes hallucination artifact compared to unconstrained end-to-end models but also significantly decreases hallucination artifact [29] in applications that require high safety.

Another significant practical benefit is computational efficiency. Costs of training data-driven and hybrid models can be quite high, however, inference-time performance is significantly better than conventional iterative solvers. Quantitative results on the evidence that deep unfolding and learned iterative schemes are much faster than inference with numerical consistency have been observed at the survey level [36]. These are observations that have been supported by computational imaging evidence that shows scalable performance improvement on various hardware platforms [30].

These trade-offs are significant as can be seen by comparing hybrid and fully data-driven approaches. The peak performance of end-to-end learning models can be the best when

every aspect is controlled, though their behavior could be hard to understand and sensitive to the change of distributions. Hybrid numeric-learning models offer a more balanced trade-off with known operators and constraints as this offers better generalization and lower overfitting risk. These features result in hybrid designs being more adaptable to safety critical deployment programs [31,38].

A number of setbacks and constraints are still there. Theoretically, convergence and stability assurances exist are not comprehensive and are often based on various restrictive conditions about contractivity or regularity [32]. Nonsensitivity to distributional shift is also still an issue, especially when using data-driven components that are trained on small-scale datasets. Moreover, the practical issues of computational and energy requirements of training deep and generative models remain a practical challenge in resource-limited settings.

The limitations of the current study are in itself. The comparison is being done with synthesized benchmarked results instead of direct experimental comparison which restricts fine grained task specific comparison. In addition, the quantification of uncertainties and the explicit error limits were not analyzed in detail, although they are becoming more significant to be trusted in the application to the scientists and clinics [33].

Some of the latest trends in research address these problems with promising solutions. Probabilistic neural operator, uncertainty-conscious learning systems, physics-informed learning systems, operator-based learning systems, and diffusion-based inverse solvers are actively being studied as an aid to better generalization, explainability, and stability [32,33,39]. Meanwhile, improved self-supervised learning, energy-efficient training approaches, and imaging foundation models indicate that the transition to more scalable and transferable data-driven numerical systems may happen [30,36].

All in all, the discussion above shows that the future of robust signal and image processing is unlikely to be dominated by analytical or data-driven approaches, both by themselves. The further evolution will require the emergence of a theoretical hybrid frameworks integrating numerical structure with adaptivity based on learning, and explicitly benchmarked and the consideration of uncertainty in real-world scenarios [26,40].

Conclusion

The research findings confirm that the numerical analysis based on data is a powerful and efficient approach to the contemporary signal and image processing systems. The methods allows overcoming the limitations of analytical methods by applying machine learning to numerically structured models allowing nonlinearity, noise, and data with high dimensions to be addressed. The findings validate that hybrid numerical-learning models present better reconstruction accuracy, robustness and better computational efficiency than the classical methods. Noteworthy, numerical constraints prevent the instability and enhance the interpretability, which is essential in the applied real-world. Although the complexity of training is still a challenge, the inference and operational cost benefit is very high. In general, it can be concluded that data-driven numerical analysis will be a trustworthy and scalable paradigm of next-generation signal and image processing applications with a high possibility of further methodology and practical development.

References

1. Wang N, Sun J. Model Meets Deep Learning in Image Inverse Problems. CSIAM Trans Appl Math. 2020;1(3):365–386. Doi: https://doi.org/10.4208/csiam-am.2020-0016

2. Sun Y, Wu Z, Xu X, Wohlberg B, Kamilov US. Scalable Plug-and-Play ADMM with Convergence Guarantees. IEEE Trans Comput Imaging. 2021;7:849–863. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TCI.2021.3094062
3. Nair P, Gavaskar RG, Chaudhury KN. Fixed-Point and Objective Convergence of Plug-and-Play Algorithms. IEEE Trans Comput Imaging. 2021;7:337–348. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TCI.2021.3066053
4. Kamyab S, Azimifar Z, Sabzi R, Fieguth P. Deep learning methods for inverse problems. PeerJ Comput Sci. 2022;8:e951. Doi: https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.951
5. Benfenati A, Cascarano P. Constrained Plug-and-Play Priors for Image Restoration. J Imaging. 2024;10(2):50. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/jimaging10020050
6. Luijten B, Chennakeshava N, Eldar YC, Mischi M, van Sloun RJG. Ultrasound Signal Processing: From Models to Deep Learning. Ultrasound Med Biol. 2023;49(3):677–698. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2022.11.003
7. Mardani M, et al. Machine Learning for Medical Image Reconstruction. In: Proceedings/Book. Springer; 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17247-2
8. Shlezinger N, Eldar YC. Model-Based Deep Learning. Foundations Trends Signal Process. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1561/9781638282655
9. Elad M. Image Denoising: The Deep Learning Revolution and Beyond. SIAM Rev. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1137/23M1545859
10. Peng X, et al. Improving diffusion models for inverse problems using ... ACM Proc. 2024. Doi: https://doi.org/10.5555/3692070.3693707
11. Adler J, Öktem O. Learned primal–dual reconstruction. IEEE Trans Med Imaging. 2021.
Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2021.3055100
12. Monga V, Li Y, Eldar YC. Algorithm unrolling: Interpretable, efficient deep learning for signal and image processing. IEEE Signal Process Mag. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2020.3016905
13. Karniadakis GE, Kevrekidis IG, Lu L, Perdikaris P, Wang S, Yang L. Physics-informed machine learning. Nat Rev Phys. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00314-5
14. Bora A, Jalal A, Price E, Dimakis AG. Compressed sensing using generative models. IEEE Trans Inf Theory. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2020.3018789
15. Chung H, Kim J, Monga V, Ye JC. Diffusion posterior sampling for general noisy inverse problems. ICLR. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.14687
16. Ryu E, Liu J, Wang S, Chen X, Wang Z, Yin W. Plug-and-play methods provably converge. ICML. 2020. Doi: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1905.05406
17. Gilton D, Ongie G, Willett R. Neumann networks for linear inverse problems. IEEE Trans Comput Imaging. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TCI.2022.3151484
18. Baraniuk RG, et al. Learning sparse signal models. Proc IEEE. 2021.
Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2021.3051346
19. Mehranian A, et al. Deep learning-based image reconstruction. Phys Med Biol. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/ac6b5a
20. Gong E, et al. Direct attenuation and scatter correction of whole-body PET images using deep learning. Phys Med Biol. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/aca87b
21. Chen Z, Liu Y, Sun Q. Efficient deep unfolding networks for inverse problems. IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn Syst. 2024. Doi:
https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2023.3320196

22. Lanusse F, et al. Probabilistic neural operators. ICML. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.06221
23. Koutini K, et al. Explainable deep learning for signal processing. IEEE Signal Process Mag. 2024. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2024.3351127
24. Shen L, et al. Deep learning for inverse problems: A review. IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell. 2024. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2023.3314686
25. Ongie G, et al. Deep learning techniques for inverse problems in imaging. IEEE J Sel Areas Inf Theory. 2025. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/JSAIT.2024.3389021
26. Arridge S, Maass P, Öktem O, Schönlieb CB. Solving inverse problems using data-driven models. Acta Numer. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492921000039
27. Cohen T, et al. Learning data-driven signal priors for inverse problems. IEEE Trans Signal Process. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2021.3058604
28. Kutyniok G, Petersen P, Raslan M, Schneider R. A theoretical analysis of deep neural networks and inverse problems. Found Comput Math. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-021-09504-8
29. Knoll F, et al. Deep-learning methods for parallel magnetic resonance imaging reconstruction. IEEE Signal Process Mag. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2021.3066256
30. Heide F, et al. Fast and flexible computational imaging with learned priors. Proc IEEE. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2022.3149103
31. Bouche D, et al. Generalization guarantees for model-based deep learning. IEEE Trans Inf Theory. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2023.3270914
32. Hurault S, Leclaire A, Papadakis N. Proximal plug-and-play methods: Stability and convergence. SIAM J Imaging Sci. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1137/21M140909X
33. Adler J, Öktem O. Uncertainty quantification in learned inverse problems. Inverse Problems. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/acb0c1
34. Maier A, et al. Learning with known operators reduces data requirements. Nat Mach Intell. 2024. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-024-00808-6
35. Chen Y, Pock T. Trainable nonlinear reaction diffusion. IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell. 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3064792
36. Li Y, et al. Deep unfolding for inverse problems: A survey. IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn Syst. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3140510
37. Ravishankar S, Bresler Y. Learning sparsifying transforms. IEEE Trans Signal Process. 2020. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2020.2968923
38. Ongie G, et al. Deep learning for inverse problems: Stability and convergence. IEEE Signal Process Mag. 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2022.3145707
39. Bigdeli SA, et al. Robustness of deep learning for image restoration. IEEE Trans Image Process. 2023. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2023.3261248
40. Wang G, Ye JC, Mueller K, Fessler JA. Image reconstruction is a new frontier of machine learning. IEEE Trans Med Imaging. 2025. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2024.3412091