

Unveiling Deep Shadows: A Survey on Image and Video Shadow Detection, Removal, and Generation in the Era of Deep Learning

Xiaowei Hu, Zhenghao Xing, Tianyu Wang, Chi-Wing Fu, and Pheng-Ann Heng

Abstract—Shadows are formed when light encounters obstacles, leading to areas of diminished illumination. In computer vision, shadow detection, removal, and generation are crucial for enhancing scene understanding, refining image quality, ensuring visual consistency in video editing, and improving virtual environments. This paper presents a comprehensive survey of shadow detection, removal, and generation in images and videos within the deep learning landscape over the past decade, covering tasks, deep models, datasets, and evaluation metrics. Our key contributions include a comprehensive survey of shadow analysis, standardization of experimental comparisons, exploration of the relationships among model size, speed, and performance, a cross-dataset generalization study, identification of open issues and future directions, and provision of publicly available resources to support further research.

Index Terms—Shadow detection, shadow removal, shadow generation, instance shadow detection, and deep learning.



1 INTRODUCTION

“Your shadow is evidence that you possess an Earthly presence. Your soul is evidence that you also possess a Divine presence.” - Matshona Dhliwayo.

The interplay of light and matter gives rise to shadows, tangible evidence of our earthly existence and a subtle reminder of the divine within. As poetic as this intersection may be, shadows, in a scientific context, manifest when light encounters obstacles, creating areas of diminished illumination in their wake. These shadow formations cast by occluding objects reveal insights into the interplay of light intensity, geometry, and the relationships between objects and their surroundings.

In the realm of computer vision and multimedia processing, the exploration of shadows extends beyond the poetic into the pragmatic. The detection, removal, and generation of shadows in images and videos represent an ongoing endeavor with broad implications. Accurate shadow detection enhances scene understanding by providing crucial visual cues for interpreting lighting conditions and unseen light occluders. Techniques for refining image quality through shadow removal are indispensable for effective visual communication, especially in the realm of photography, where aesthetic appeal is paramount. Shadow generation is pivotal in crafting immersive virtual environments and compelling content in computer graphics and augmented reality.

The advent of deep learning has significantly enhanced the performance of shadow detection, removal, and generation. However, the proliferation of research featuring a multitude of deep models, datasets, and task formulations poses a challenge for researchers and practitioners seeking to comprehend and compare the core principles of state-of-the-art designs. In the past decade, there has not been a comprehensive review of deep-learning-based

techniques for detecting, removing, and generating shadows in images and videos. In response, this survey provides an in-depth survey of shadow analysis in the era of deep learning.

Our survey delves into various aspects of shadow analysis, covering tasks, deep models, datasets, evaluation metrics, and result comparisons. We start by presenting a taxonomic review of existing methods and datasets. Beyond that, we conduct various experiments to assess the generalization capabilities of many current methods across different datasets. Additionally, we explore the relationship between model size/speed and performance, shedding light on the trade-offs within this domain. As we navigate the landscape of contemporary shadow analysis, this survey concludes with a discussion on recent advancements in artificial-intelligence-generated content (AIGC) and large models for shadow analysis and hints at future avenues for research in the dynamic field.

1.1 History and Scope

The analysis of shadow images remains a foundational challenge in computer vision, with a longstanding research emphasis. Exploring shadows in computer graphics [1] has a history spanning half a century, primarily aimed at enhancing the realism of computer-synthesized images. In the 1980s, specific attention was directed towards studying the relationship between objects (buildings) and their shadows [2]. In the 1990s, research ventured into shadow detection and removal in 2D images, with contributions from various studies [3], [4], [5], [6]. This line of inquiry expanded in the 2000s, encompassing both images and videos, as demonstrated by works such as [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16]. Later on, machine learning algorithms with hand-crafted features were extensively studied for shadow detection and removal [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24]. Since 2014 [25], algorithms based on deep learning [26] have exhibited promising performance, solidifying their status as the primary approaches for shadow analysis. This paper surveys the landscape of image and video shadow detection, removal, and generation

*X. Hu is with Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, Shanghai, China.
Z. Xing, C.-W. Fu and P.-A. Heng are with the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China.
T. Wang is with Adobe Research, San Francisco, CA, USA.
X. Hu and Z. Xing are the joint-first authors.*

over the past decade in the era of deep learning. This survey does not cover shadow analysis in remote sensing, which uses various modality inputs such as radar, visible, and infrared data. For a detailed survey on remote sensing, refer to [27].

1.2 Related Previous Surveys

The earliest survey [28] reviews the types of shadows and shadow generation algorithms in computer graphics. [29], [30] review shadow detection methods in videos, encompassing deterministic model and non-model-based, and statistical parametric and non-parametric methods. Surveys on shadow detection and removal in the 2010s are summarized as follows [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [38]. [31] surveys shadow detection methods, organized based on object/environment dependency and implementation domain. [32] reviews shadow detection methods in a feature-based taxonomy. [33], [37] review shadow detection and removal methods in remote sensing. [34] reviews image-based shadow detection and removal methods in real images. [35] reviews shadow detection methods using difference index and succeeding thresholding. [36] analyzes the performance of shadow detection techniques for images and videos in various scenarios, including indoor and outdoor scenes, fixed or moving cameras, and detection of umbra and penumbra shadows. [38] categorizes shadow detection methods into five categories: invariant-based detection, feature-based detection, region-based detection, color model-based detection, and interactive shadow detection.

Recently, deep learning methods have been reviewed for shadow detection in remote sensing [39] and satellite images [40]. The concurrent work [41] surveys deep models for single-image shadow removal but neglects methods for video, facial, and document shadow removal, and other shadow-related tasks. Additionally, it does not incorporate the latest datasets, shadow masks, and evaluation metrics that scale up data samples or address errors from previous works. Crucially, the study fails to re-train deep models under unified settings for experimental comparisons.

To date, there is no comprehensive survey covering deep-learning-based methods for shadow detection, removal, and generation in both images and videos over the past decade.

1.3 Contributions of Our Work

In this paper, our contributions are summarized as follows:

- **A Comprehensive Survey of Shadow Analysis in the Deep Learning Era.** We present a thorough survey of shadow analysis, covering various aspects such as tasks, levels of supervision, and learning paradigms. Our taxonomies aim to enhance researchers’ understanding of key features in shadow analysis and its applications in the deep learning landscape.
- **Fair Comparisons of the Existing Methods.** Currently, comparisons among existing methods suffer from inconsistencies in input sizes, evaluation metrics, different datasets, and implementation platforms. This paper standardizes experimental setting and performs experiments on the same platform across various methods to ensure fair comparison. Moreover, the experiments will take place on newly refined datasets, in which noisy labels or ground-truth images have been corrected.
- **Exploration of Model Size, Speed, and Performance Relationships.** Unlike previous shadow analysis studies that focus solely on final performance metrics, we also examine the model

sizes and inference speeds, highlighting the complex interplay between these characteristics and performance.

- **Cross-Dataset Generalization Study.** Recognizing the inherent biases in shadow datasets, we conduct a cross-dataset generalization study on existing datasets to assess the generalization capability of deep models across diverse datasets, contributing valuable insights into the robustness of these models.
- **Overview of Open Issues and Future Directions with AIGC and Large Models.** We explore open issues in shadow analysis, focusing on image and video perception, editing, and the impact on AIGC and large vision/language models. Our insights suggest future research directions, providing a roadmap for advancements in shadow analysis and its applications.
- **Publicly Available Results, Trained Models, and Evaluation Metrics.** We offer results, trained models, and evaluation metrics under fair comparison settings, along with new datasets, at <https://github.com/xw-hu/Unveiling-Deep-Shadows> to facilitate future research and advancing the field.

Together, these contributions provide a comprehensive survey, setting it apart from earlier review papers. The subsequent sections of the paper are organized as follows. Sections 2-5 present a comprehensive survey on shadow detection, instance shadow detection, shadow removal, and shadow generation, respectively. Each section contains the introductions of deep models, datasets, evaluation metrics, and experimental results. Section 6 delves into the discussion on shadow analysis and highlights open issues and research challenges in the field.

2 SHADOW DETECTION

Shadow detection predicts binary masks that indicate shadow regions in input images or videos. Locating the shadows enables shadow editing and facilitates shadow region analysis, essential for advanced computer vision tasks like object detection and tracking.

This subsection provides a comprehensive overview of deep models designed for shadow detection in both images and videos. Additionally, it summarizes commonly-used datasets and metrics for evaluating shadow detection methods. To assess the effectiveness of different models across various aspects, we conduct experiments and present the comparative results.

2.1 Deep Models for Image Shadow Detection

Table 1 shows the essential properties of different methods, providing a convenient reference for comprehending the landscape of image shadow detection within the realm of deep learning.

Initially, early deep-learning methods use deep convolutional neural networks to predict shadow characteristics, including the shadow boundary and local shadow patch, based on the input image. Subsequently, there was a shift towards end-to-end deep neural networks specifically designed to directly generate shadow masks from shadow images. Another approach involved employing multi-task learning, where models were trained to simultaneously perform shadow detection and shadow removal. After that methods based on the semi-supervised, self-supervised, and large vision models are proposed to further improve the performance on various scenarios. In the following subsections, we provide a detailed description of methods within each of these categories.

TABLE 1: Deep models for image shadow detection. *: real-time detector; #: extra supervision from others; \$: additional training data.

Years	#	Methods	Publications	Backbones	Supervision Levels	Learning Paradigm
2014	[25], [42]	CNN-CRF	CVPR	7-layer network	Fully supervised	Component
2015	[43]	SCNN-LinearOpt	CVPR	7-layer network	Fully supervised	Component
2016	[44], [45]	Stacked-CNN	ECCV	VGG16	Fully supervised	Component
2017	[46]	scGAN	ICCV	U-Net	Fully supervised	Single-task
2018	[47]	Patched-CNN	IROS	7-layer network	Fully supervised	Component
2018	[48]	ST-CGAN	CVPR	U-Net	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2018	[49], [50]	DSC	CVPR	VGG16	Fully supervised	Single-task
2018	[51]	DC-DSPF	IJCAI	VGG16	Fully supervised	Single-task
2018	[52]	CPNet	MMSP	U-Net	Fully supervised	Single-task
2018	[53]	A+D Net*	ECCV	U-Net	Fully supervised	Single-task
2018	[54]	BDRAR	ECCV	ResNeXt101	Fully supervised	Single-task
2019	[55]	DSDNet#	CVPR	ResNeXt101	Fully supervised	Single-task
2019	[56]	ARGAN/ARGAN+SS\$	ICCV	10-layer CNN + LSTM + CNN	Fully/Semi-supervised	Multi-task
2019	[57]	CPAdv-Net	TIP	U-Net	Fully supervised	Single-task
2020	[58]	MTMT-Net\$	CVPR	ResNeXt101	Semi-supervised	Multi-task
2020	[59]	DSSDNet	P&RS	-	Fully supervised	Single-task
2021	[60]	FDRNet	ICCV	EfficientNet-B3	Self-supervised	Multi-task
2021	[61]	FSDNet*	TIP	MobileNet-V2	Fully supervised	Single-task
2021	[62]	ECA	ACM MM	ResNet101	Fully supervised	Single-task
2021	[63]	RCMPNet#	ACM MM	ResNet	Fully supervised	Single-task
2022	[64]	SDCM	ACM MM	EfficientNet-B3	Fully supervised	Single-task
2022	[65]	TransShadow	ICASSP	EfficientNet-B1	Fully supervised	Single-task
2023	[66]	SILT\$	ICCV	U-Net and others	Self-supervised	Single-task
2023	[67]	Sun et al.	ICCV	VGG16 + ConvNeXt	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2023	[68]	R2D#	WACV	ResNeXt101	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2023	[69]	LRA&LDRA\$	WACV	-	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2023	[70]	SDDNet	ACM MM	EfficientNet-B3	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2023	[71]	(SDTR/SDTR+)\$*	TCSVT	MiT-B2	Semi/Weakly-supervised	Single-task
2023	[72]	SAM-Adapter	ICCVW	SAM(ViT-H)	Fully supervised	Single-task
2023	[73]	ShadowSAM	TGRS	SAM(ViT-B)	Un/Fully supervised	Single-task
2023	[74]	AdapterShadow	arXiv	SAM(ViT-B)+EfficientNet-B1	Fully supervised	Single-task

2.1.1 Component Learning

Early methods mainly adopt convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to generate shadow characteristics and then use statistical modeling methods (*e.g.*, conditional random field (CRF)) to obtain the final shadow masks.

- **CNN-CRF** [25], [42] adopts multiple CNNs to learn MN features at the super-pixel level and along the object boundaries, and then uses the CRF model to generate smooth shadow contours.
- **SCNN-LinearOpt** [43] uses a CNN to capture local structures of shadow edges and the relevant features, and then formulates a least-square optimization to predict the shadow masks.
- **Stacked-CNN** [44], [45] employs a fully convolutional neural network (FCN) [75] to output an image-level shadow prior map, followed by a patch-CNN to generate local shadow masks. Then, a weighted average is used to fuse multiple predictions.
- **Patched-CNN** [47] first adopts the support vector machine with statistical features to obtain a shadow prior map, and then uses the CNN to predict shadow probability map of the patches.

Using deep convolutional neural networks to learn shadow characteristics is only adopted in the early approaches. Deep models in the categories below are all trained end-to-end.

2.1.2 Single-Task Learning

With the development of deep neural networks, methods employ end-to-end deep models for shadow detection by predicting the output shadow masks directly from the input shadow images.

- **scGAN** [46] is a conditional generative adversarial network with a tenable sensitivity parameter in the loss to regulate the amount of shadow pixels in the predicted shadow mask.
- **DSC** [49], [50] formulates a direction-aware spatial context (DSC) module to analyze image context in a direction-aware manner. This module is used in a CNN to generate multi-scale shadow masks, which are merged into the final shadow mask.

- **DC-DSPF** [51] stacks multiple parallel fusion branches to formulate a network, which is trained in a deeply supervised way, and then uses the densely cascaded learning scheme to recurrently refine the predictions.
- **CPNet** [52] adds the residual connections [76] into the U-Net [77] to identify the shadow regions.
- **A+D Net** [53] uses an attenuator (A-Net) to generate realistic images with attenuated shadows that act as additional hard training examples, which are used with the original training data to train a detector (D-Net) to predict shadow masks. Note that it is a fast shadow detector that achieves real-time performance.
- **BDRAR** [54] introduces the recurrent attention residual module to combine features from adjacent CNN layers and learn an attention map to recurrently select and refine residual context features. Also, it develops a bidirectional feature pyramid network to aggregate shadow features across different CNN layers.
- **DSDNet** [55] designs the Distraction-aware Shadow (DS) module to learn distraction-aware and discriminative features by explicitly predicting false positives and false negatives. Note that the predicted false positives and false negatives are from its basic model and other shadow detectors [49], [53], [54].
- **CPAdv-Net** [57] designs a mapping scheme in the skip connection between the encoder layers and the decoder layers in the U-Net. Besides, it introduces two adversarial example generators to generate data from the original images for training.
- **DSSDNet** [59] adopts the encoder-decoder residual structure and deeply supervised progressive fusion modules to predict the shadow masks on aerial images.
- **FSDNet** [61], a fast shadow detection network, adopts the DSC module [49], [50] to aggregate global features and formulates a detail enhancement module to harvest shadow details in low-level feature maps. It uses MobileNet V2 [78] as the backbone to achieve real-time performance.

- **ECA** [62] adopts multiple parallel convolutions with different kernels to augment effective object contexts in proper scales.
- **RCMPNet** [63] presents a relative confidence map regression approach, employing a proposed prediction network to assess the reliability of shadow detection methods [54], [55], [58] and incorporating attention-based LSTM sub-modules to enhance the prediction of confidence map.
- **SDCM** [64] employs two parallel branches to concurrently generate shadow and non-shadow masks, capitalizing on their complementary nature. Utilizing negative activation, identity reconstruction loss, and discriminative losses during training enhances the accuracy of the shadow detection results.
- **TransShadow** [65] uses a multi-level feature-aware module leveraging Transformer to distinguish shadow and non-shadow regions, and incorporates progressive upsampling with skip connections for feature enhancement.

2.1.3 Multi-Task Learning

Some approaches adopt the end-to-end deep neural network to perform not only the mask prediction task but also other tasks, such as predicting the shadow-free images for shadow removal. These multi-task approaches benefit from the mutually improvements or better understanding of the shadow images.

- **ST-CGAN** [48] uses two sequential conditional GANs, where the first network predicts the shadow mask and the second network predicts the shadow-free image by taking the shadow image and shadow mask as the inputs.
- **ARGAN** [56] develops the attentive recurrent generative adversarial network for both shadow detection and removal. The generator produces shadow attention maps and recovers shadow-free images through multiple progressive steps in a coarse-to-fine manner. Additionally, ARGAN can be trained in a semi-supervised manner using unlabeled data, leveraging the adversarial loss in GAN [79].
- **R2D** [68] enhances shadow detection performance by leveraging shadow features learned during shadow removal. The proposed FCSD-Net architecture, integrated into the R2D framework, focuses on extracting fine context feature through a specially-designed detector block. It uses the false positives and false negatives and the DS modules in DSDNet [55].
- **LRA&LDRA** [69] optimizes residuals in a stack paradigm [48] to simultaneously address shadow detection and removal challenges, guiding to prioritize shadow region reconstruction and contribute to the final blending/color correction, while reducing overhead and improving accuracy across diverse backbone architectures. It generates a paired dataset with shadow images, shadow-free images, and shadow masks for pre-training.
- **SDDNet** [70] introduces the style-guided dual-layer disentanglement network for shadow detection, utilizing the feature separation and recombination module to separate shadow and background layers through differentiated supervisions. Simultaneous joint training ensures separation reliability, and the shadow style filter module introduces style constraints (represented by the Gram matrix [80]), enhancing feature disentanglement quality.
- **Sun et al.** [67] present an adaptive illumination mapping (AIM) module that transforms raw images into sRGB images with varying intensities, paired with a shadow detection module leveraging multi-scale contrast information. A feedback mechanism guides AIM to render sRGB images with different illumination in a shadow-aware manner.

2.1.4 Semi-Supervised Learning

Training deep models for shadow detection requires labeled shadow masks, so the limited amount of training data affects the performance of deep models in complicated situations. Hence, semi-supervised shadow detectors are proposed to train the models on both labeled and unlabeled shadow images.

- **ARGAN+SS** [56] as described in Sec 2.1.3.
- **MTMT-Net** [58] is a successful semi-supervised method for shadow detection, which builds a multi-task mean teacher network based on the teacher-student (mean teacher [81]) architecture for semi-supervised learning. Both teacher and student networks detect shadow regions, shadow edges, and shadow count in a multi-task learning manner.
- **SDTR & SDTR+** [71] denote semi-supervised and weakly-supervised shadow detectors, respectively. The procedure for new shadow images involves identifying unreliable samples through a reliable sample selection scheme. Subsequently, one has the option to retrain reliable samples, re-infer unreliable samples for precise pseudo masks, or employ flexible annotations (e.g., box, point, scribble) and derive insights to improve the generalization ability of deep models. Utilizing the MiT-B2 backbone [82], both SDTR and SDTR+ operate in real-time.

2.1.5 Self-Supervised Learning

Self-supervised learning adopts data itself as the supervision to learn the deep features. This idea is achieved on the existing training dataset or using extra data.

- **FDRNet** [60] designs a feature decomposition and reweighting scheme to mitigate the bias of deep shadow detectors to the intensity cue. It first adopts two self-supervised tasks to learn the intensity-variant and intensity-invariant features by using adjusted brightness images as the supervision. Then, it re-weights the features using cumulative learning [83].
- **SILT** [66] formulates the Shadow-aware Iterative Label Tuning framework, featuring shadow-aware data augmentation, global-local fusion for mask prediction, shadow-aware filtering, and integrating of zero-labeled shadow-free images to improve the recognition of non-shadow regions. It collects some Internet images (dark objects & shadow-free images) to further help train the network to differentiate shadows and dark objects. Various basic networks are used as the backbone with the U-Net, such as ResNeXt101 [84], EfficientNet [85], and PVT v2 [86].

2.1.6 Large Vision Models

Modern large vision models demonstrate promising performance in general vision tasks. For instance, the “segment anything” model (SAM) [97] exhibits impressive zero-shot performance in image segmentation across diverse object categories. Nevertheless, it is still hard [98] to deal with shadows cast on intricate backgrounds and complex scenarios. To improve SAM’s performance on shadow detection, various aim to finetune only the newly-added or a part of structures on SAM.

- **SAM-Adapter** [72] employs SAM as its backbone, enhancing performance through the incorporation of customized information. This involves the integration of two MLPs as adapters in each layer of the SAM encoder, while fine-tuning both the adapter and SAM masked decoder.
- **ShadowSAM** [73] employs two MLPs and a GELU activation function as the prompter, integrated into multiple layers

TABLE 2: Deep models for video shadow detection. *: real-time shadow removal methods; \$: additional training data.

Years	#	Methods	Publications	Backbones	Supervision Levels	Learning Paradigm
2021	[87]	TVSD-Net	CVPR	ResNeXt101	Fully supervised	Single task
2021	[88]	Hu et al.	arXiv	MobileNetV2	Fully supervised	Single task
2022	[89]	STICT\$*	CVPR	ResNet50	Semi-supervised	Single task
2022	[90]	SC-Cor	ECCV	-	Fully supervised	Single task
2022	[91]	STF-Net*	VRCAI	Res2Net50	Fully supervised	Single task
2023	[92]	SCOTCH and SODA	CVPR	MiT-B3	Fully supervised	Single task
2023	[93]	ShadowSAM	TCSVT	SAM(ViT-B)+MobileNetV2	Fully supervised	Single task
2024	[94]	RSM-Net	ACM MM	ResNet50 + RoBERTa	Fully supervised	Referring (with language)
2024	[95]	TBGDiff	ACM MM	MiT-B3	Fully supervised	Multi-task
2024	[96]	Duan et al.	ECCV	Segformer	Fully supervised	Single task

of the SAM encoder. It generates pseudo masks using non-deep-learning methods and improves them with an illumination and texture-guided updating strategy. The method includes a mask diversity index for incremental curriculum learning. ShadowSAM is trainable in both unsupervised (with pseudo masks) and supervised modes.

- **AdapterShadow** [74] inserts trainable adapters into the frozen image encoder of SAM for fine-tuning. Also, a grid sampling method is introduced to automatically generate dense point prompts from the predicted coarse shadow masks. Note that the backbone of SAM is ViT-H [99] and the backbone of the auxiliary network is EfficientNet-B1 [85].

2.2 Deep Models for Video Shadow Detection

Video shadow detection processes dynamic scenes and generates consistent shadow masks in video frames. The learning-oriented dataset and method for video shadow detection are formulated by [87]. Table 2 encapsulates the essential properties of the surveyed papers.

- **TVSD-Net** [87], the pioneer in deep-learning-based video shadow detection, employs triple parallel networks collaboratively to obtain discriminative representations at intra-video and inter-video levels. The network includes a dual gated co-attention module to constrain features from neighboring frames in the same video, along with an auxiliary similarity loss for capturing semantic information between different videos.
- **Hu et al.** [88] employs an optical-flow-based warping module to align and combine features between frames, applying it across multiple deep-network layers to extract information from neighboring frames, and encompassing both local details and high-level semantic information.
- **STICT** [89] uses mean-teacher learning to combine labeled images and unlabeled video frames for real-time shadow detection. It introduces spatio-temporal interpolation consistency training for better generalization and temporal consistency.
- **SC-Cor** [90] employs correspondence learning to improve fine-grained pixel-wise similarity in a pixel-to-set manner, refining pixel alignment within shadow regions across frames. It enhances temporal consistency and seamlessly serves as a plug-and-play module in existing shadow detectors with no computational cost.
- **STF-Net** [91] efficiently detects shadows in videos in real-time using Res2Net50 [100] as its backbone, introducing a straightforward yet effective spatial-temporal fusion block to leverage both temporal and spatial information.
- **SCOTCH and SODA** [92] form a video shadow detection framework. SCOTCH uses supervised contrastive loss to enhance shadow feature discrimination, while SODA applies a spatial-temporal aggregation mechanism to manage shadow

deformations. This combination improves feature learning and spatial-temporal dynamics.

- **ShadowSAM** [93] fine-tunes SAM [97] to detect shadows in the first frame using bounding boxes as prompts and employs a long-short-term network with MobileNetV2 as the backbone to propagate the mask across the video, using long-short-term attention to enhance performance.
- **RSM-Net** [94] introduces the referring video shadow detection task and proposes a referring shadow-track memory network that utilizes a twin-track synergistic memory and mixed-prior shadow attention to segment specific shadows in videos based on descriptive natural language prompts.
- **TBGDiff** [95] is the first diffusion model for video shadow detection by extracting temporal guidance and boundary information, using dual scale aggregation for temporal signal and an auxiliary head for boundary context extraction and timeline temporal guidance via space-time encoded embedding.
- **Duan et al.** [96] uses a two-stage training paradigm, starting with a pre-trained image-domain model that is adapted to the video domain using a temporal-adaption block for temporal consistency and a spatial-adaption block for integrating high-resolution local patches with global context features. Control-Net [101]-like structure is used in these two blocks.

2.3 Shadow Detection Datasets

Next, we exclusively discuss widely-used datasets for model training and evaluation, omitting other data for additional semi/weakly-supervised training.

2.3.1 Image Datasets for Shadow Detection

Earlier datasets, *i.e.*, UCF [18] and UIUC [19], are prepared to train the traditional machine learning methods with hand-crafted features. UCF consists of 245 images, featuring 117 captured in diverse outdoor environments, encompassing campus and downtown areas. The remaining images are sourced from existing datasets. For each image, shadows have been meticulously hand-labeled at the pixel level, with validation performed by two individuals. UIUC has 108 shadow images with the labeled shadow masks and shadow-free images, which is the first to enable quantitative evaluation of shadow removal on dozens of images.

Later, datasets with thousands of shadow images are collected to train the deep-learning models.

- **SBU** [45], [102], [44] & **SBU-Refine** [66]: SBU is a large-scale shadow dataset with 4,087 training and 638 testing images, using a lazy labeling approach where users initially coarsely label shadow and non-shadow regions. An optimization algorithm refines these labels. SBU-Refine relabels the test set manually and refines the noise labels in training set by algorithm.

- **ISTD** [48] is a dataset with shadow images, shadow-free images, and shadow masks, designed for shadow detection and removal. It includes 1,330 training images, 540 testing images, and 135 distinct background scenes. See *ISTD+* in Sec. 4.3.
- **CUHK-Shadow** [61] is a large dataset with 10,500 shadow images, including 7,350 for training, 1,050 for validation, and 2,100 for testing. It features five categories: (i) Shadow-ADE: 1,132 ADE20K images (building shadows), (ii) Shadow-KITTI: 2,773 KITTI images (vehicle, tree, roadside shadows), (iii) Shadow-MAP: 1,595 Google Maps photos, (iv) Shadow-USR: 2,445 USR images (people and object shadows), and (v) Shadow-WEB: 2,555 Internet images from Flickr.
- **SynShadow** [103] is a synthetic dataset of 10,000 shadow/shadow-free/matte image triplets, generated using a shadow illumination model and 3D models. It assumes occluders outside the camera view and flat surfaces for shadow projection, with shadow-free images from USR [104], supporting pre-training or zero-shot learning.
- **SARA** [67] includes 7,019 raw images with shadow masks, split into 6,143 for training and 876 for testing, featuring shadows from 17 categories across 11 backgrounds.

2.3.2 Video Datasets for Shadow Detection

- **ViSha** [87] features 120 diverse videos with pixel-level shadow annotations using binary masks. It contains 11,685 frames across 390 seconds, standardized to 30 fps, and is divided into a 5:7 training-testing ratio.
- **RVSD** [94] selects 86 videos from ViSha, re-annotating them with separate shadow instances and descriptive natural language prompts, ensuring quality through validation.
- **CVSD** [96] is the complex video shadow dataset, containing 196 video clips across 149 categories with diverse shadow patterns. It includes 278,504 annotated shadow areas and 19,757 frames with shadow masks in complex scenarios.

2.4 Evaluation Metrics

2.4.1 Evaluation Metrics for Image Shadow Detection

- **BER** [44] (Balanced Error Rate) serves as a common metric for assessing shadow detection performance. In this evaluation, shadow and non-shadow regions contribute equally, regardless of their relative areas. The BER is computed using the formula:

$$BER = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{TP}{TP + FN} + \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \right) \right) \times 100, \quad (1)$$

where TP , TN , FP , and FN represent true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. To calculate these values, the predicted shadow mask is first quantized into a binary mask. Pixels are set to one if the values exceed 0.5 and zero otherwise. This binary mask is then compared with the ground-truth mask. A lower BER value indicates a more effective detection result. Occasionally, BER values for both shadow and non-shadow regions are also provided.

- **F_β^ω -measure** [105], [61] is proposed for evaluating non-binary prediction values in shadow masks. This metric calculates precision and recall in a weighted manner, with a higher F_β^ω indicating a superior result.

2.4.2 Evaluation Metrics for Video Shadow Detection

The first paper [87] in video shadow detection with deep learning uses the Mean Absolute Error (MAE), F-measure (F_β), Intersection over Union (IoU), and Balance Error Rate (BER) to




Fig. 1: Shadow detection methods on the SBU-Refine (left) and CUHK-Shadow (right) datasets: accuracy, parameters (indicated by the area of the bubbles), and speed.

evaluate the performance. However, the evaluation is only on individual image (frame-level) without capturing the temporal stability. Ding *et al.* [90] introduces the temporal stability metric.

- **Temporal Stability (TS)** [90] calculates the optical flow between the ground-truth labels of two adjacent frames, denoted as Y_t and Y_{t+1} . While ARFlow [106] was originally used for optical flow calculation, this paper adopts RAFT [107]. This approach is employed because the motions of shadows are difficult to capture in RGB frames. Define $I_{t \rightarrow t+1}$ as the optical flow between Y_t and Y_{t+1} . Then, the reconstructed result, which warps \hat{Y}_{t+1} by the optical flow $I_{t \rightarrow t+1}$, is denoted as \hat{Y}_t . T is the number of video frames. Next, the temporal stability of video shadow detection is measured based on the flow warping Intersection over Union (IoU) between the adjacent frames:

$$TS = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \text{IoU}(\hat{Y}_t, Y_t). \quad (2)$$

2.5 Experimental Results

The reported comparison results among existing methods in their original papers suffer from inconsistencies in input sizes, evaluation metrics, datasets, and implementation platforms. Hence, we standardize experimental setting and perform experiments on the same platform across various methods to ensure a fair comparison. Besides, we further compare the methods in various aspects, including models' sizes and speeds, and perform cross-dataset evaluation for generalization capability evaluation.

2.5.1 Image Shadow Detection

Overall Performance Benchmark Results. SBU-Refine [66] and CUHK-Shadow [61] are utilized to assess the performance of various methods. SBU-Refine improves the evaluation accuracy by correcting erroneously labeled masks, thereby reducing overfitting issues in comparison methods. CUHK-Shadow, the largest real dataset, offers a diverse range of scenarios for comprehensive testing. The methods compared are listed in Table 3, and we excluded those for which code is not available. We retrained the methods using the original source code, except for DSC, which was implemented in PyTorch with a ResNeXt101 backbone. *Post-processing, such as CRF, is omitted for all compared methods.* Previous methods adopted various input sizes. In this paper, we set the input sizes to 256×256 and 512×512 to present results at two resolutions. We take BER as the evaluation metric, calculated using Python code. BERS for both shadow (BER_S) and non-shadow (BER_{NS}) regions are reported. Results are resized to the ground-truth resolution in evaluation for fair comparison.

TABLE 3: Comparing image shadow detection methods on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. \$: additional training data; *: real-time shadow detector; #: extra supervision from other methods. Please note that for the results shown in the rightmost columns, we report the cross-dataset generalization evaluation, where the models were trained on SBU-Refine and tested on SRD.

Input Size	Methods	SBU-Refine			CUHK-Shadow			Param.(M)	Infer.(images/s)	SRD (cross)		
		BER ↓	BER _S ↓	BER _{NS} ↓	BER ↓	BER _S ↓	BER _{NS} ↓			BER ↓	BER _S ↓	BER _{NS} ↓
256 × 256	DSC [49], [50]	6.79	9.36	4.23	10.97	7.49	14.45	122.49	26.86	11.10	15.82	6.39
	BDRAR [54]	6.27	8.21	4.34	10.09	7.30	12.88	42.46	39.76	9.13	11.42	6.84
	DSDNet# [55]	5.37	6.65	4.09	8.56	6.27	10.84	58.16	37.53	10.29	14.63	5.94
	MTMT-Net\$ [58]	6.32	9.77	2.86	8.90	8.70	9.10	44.13	34.04	9.97	14.90	5.04
	FDRNet [60]	5.64	7.85	3.43	14.39	17.87	10.91	10.77	41.39	11.82	17.03	6.62
	FSDNet* [61]	7.16	11.67	2.64	9.93	11.35	8.51	4.39	150.99	12.13	19.40	4.87
	ECA [62]	7.08	12.51	1.64	8.58	11.25	5.91	157.76	27.55	11.97	20.38	3.57
	SDDNet [70]	5.39	7.17	3.61	8.66	7.85	9.47	15.02	36.73	8.64	11.53	5.74
512 × 512	DSC [49], [50]	6.34	8.24	4.45	9.53	6.87	12.19	122.49	22.59	11.62	17.06	6.18
	BDRAR [54]	5.62	6.50	4.73	8.79	7.71	9.88	42.46	31.34	8.53	10.10	6.97
	DSDNet# [55]	5.04	5.47	4.60	7.79	6.44	9.14	58.16	32.69	8.92	10.58	7.27
	MTMT-Net\$ [58]	5.79	8.74	2.85	8.32	10.03	6.60	44.13	28.75	9.19	12.86	5.53
	FDRNet [60]	5.39	7.35	3.43	6.58	7.56	5.59	10.77	35.00	8.81	12.17	5.46
	FSDNet* [61]	6.80	11.47	2.13	8.84	10.29	7.39	4.39	134.47	11.94	20.10	3.79
	ECA [62]	7.52	13.43	1.61	7.99	9.50	5.25	157.76	22.41	12.71	22.45	2.97
	SDDNet [70]	4.86	6.42	3.31	7.65	6.57	8.74	15.02	37.65	7.65	10.04	5.27

TABLE 4: Comparison of video shadow detection methods on the ViSha dataset using an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. AVG represents the average score of IoU and TS, reflecting both frame-level and temporal-level IoUs. ShadowSAM uses the size of 1024x1024, while others adopt the size of 512x512.

Methods	BER ↓	IoU [%] ↑	TS [%] ↑	AVG ↑	Param. (M)	Infer. (frames/s)
TVSD-Net [87]	14.21	56.36	22.69	39.53	60.83	15.50
STICTS* [89]	13.05	43.75	39.10	41.43	26.17	91.34
SC-Cor [90]	12.80	55.56	23.68	39.62	58.16	27.91
SCOTCH and SODA [92]	10.36	61.24	25.76	43.50	53.11	16.16
ShadowSAM [93]	13.38	61.72	23.77	42.75	93.74	15.53

Table 3 and Fig. 1 illustrate the accuracy, running time, and parameters of each method. We can observe that (i) some relatively older methods perform better than recent ones, indicating an over-fitting issue on the original SBU dataset; (ii) FSDNet [61] is the only open-source (both training and testing code available) real-time shadow detector with a few parameters and fast inference speed; (iii) DSDNet [55] incorporates the results from DSC [49], [50] and BDRAR [54] in its training process and achieves comparable performance with the recent method SDDNet [70]; (iv) a larger input size usually brings performance gains but also requires more time; and (v) CUHK-Shadow is more challenging than SBU-Refine. FDRNet [60] is particularly sensitive to input resolution when detecting shadows in the CUHK-Shadow, which contains complex shadows or finer details that benefit from higher resolution inputs (512 × 512). *See the visual comparisons in the supplementary material.*

Cross-Dataset Generalization Evaluation. To evaluate the generalization capability of shadow detection methods, we perform cross-dataset evaluation by using the trained models on SBU-Refine training set to detect shadows on the SRD testing set; see Sec. 4.3. SRD is used due to its similar complexity in background features to SBU. Note that this is the first time to evaluate the generalization capability on a large-scale dataset.

The three rightmost columns in Table 3 show the results, where the performance degrades a lot, especially on the shadow region. This highlights the importance of cross-dataset evaluation for robust shadow detection. The performance drop in the shadow regions suggests that the methods struggle with varying lighting conditions and complex background textures present in SRD. Future work should focus on improving the robustness of shadow detection models to better generalize across different datasets.

Summary. As demonstrated by the experimental results, *how to develop an efficient and robust model with high detection accuracy*

for image shadow detection, especially under complex scenarios, remains a challenging problem.

2.5.2 Video Shadow Detection

ViSha [87] is used to evaluate video shadow detection methods with an input size of 512 × 512, following [88], [92]. ShadowSAM uses 1024 × 1024 due to the SAM pre-trained model’s positional embeddings. SC-Cor [90] uses the DSDNet [55] as the basic network. STICT [89] uses additional SBU dataset images for training. Except for commonly-used metrics BER and IoU for image-level evaluation, we also adopt Temporal Stability (TS), often ignored by the compared methods. Results are resized to 512 × 512 for optical flow in TS and to ground-truth resolution for other metrics.

Table 4 shows the results, showing distinct advantages and trade-offs among video shadow detection methods. SCOTCH and SODA exhibit the best overall performance with the lowest BER and highest AVG, while ShadowSAM achieves the highest IoU but with a larger model size. STICT stands out for its fastest inference speed, making it ideal for real-time applications despite a lower IoU. SC-Cor and TVSD-Net show balanced performances with moderate BER, IoU, and TS scores.

Summary. As demonstrated by the experimental results, *how to achieve an optimal balance between frame-level accuracy, temporal stability, model complexity, and inference speed in video shadow detection* remains a challenging problem.

3 INSTANCE SHADOW DETECTION

This section introduces another task, instance shadow detection, which aims to find shadows together with their associated objects. Knowing the relations between the objects and their shadows benefits lots of image/video editing applications, since it is easy to manipulate objects with their associated shadows simultaneously.

TABLE 5: Deep models for instance shadow detection.

Data	Years	#	Methods	Publications	Backbones	Supervision Levels
Image	2020	[108]	LISA	CVPR	ResNeXt101-FPN	Fully supervised
Image	2021	[109]	SSIS	CVPR	ResNet101-BiFPN	Fully supervised
Image	2023	[110]	SSISv2	TPAMI	ResNet101-BiFPN	Fully supervised
Video	2022	[111]	ViShadow	arXiv	ResNet101-BiFPN	Semi-supervised

TABLE 6: Comparisons of image instance shadow detection methods. Speed evaluated on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU.

Evaluation on the SOBA-testing Set								
Methods	$SOAP_{segm} \uparrow$	$SOAP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Param. (M)	Infer. (images/s)
LISA [108]	23.5	21.9	42.7	50.4	39.7	38.2	91.26	8.16
SSIS [109]	29.9	26.8	52.3	59.2	43.5	41.5	57.87	5.83
SSISv2 [110]	35.3	29.0	59.2	63.0	50.2	44.4	76.77	5.17
Evaluation on the SOBA-challenge Set								
Methods	$SOAP_{segm} \uparrow$	$SOAP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Param. (M)	Infer. (images/s)
LISA [108]	10.2	9.8	21.6	26.0	23.9	24.7	91.26	4.52
SSIS [109]	12.8	12.9	28.4	32.5	25.7	26.5	57.87	2.26
SSISv2 [110]	17.7	15.0	34.5	37.2	31.0	28.4	76.77	1.91

This task is first formulated by [108] at the image level, and then extended to videos by [111]. Table 5 encapsulates the essential properties of the surveyed methods.

3.1 Deep Models for Image Instance Shadow Detection

Instance shadow detection aims to detect shadow instances and the associated object instances that cast each shadow.

- **LISA** [108] initiates by generating region proposals likely to contain shadow/object instances and their associations. For each proposal, it predicts bounding boxes and masks for individual shadow/object instances, generates bounding boxes for shadow-object associations (pairs), and estimates the light direction for each shadow-object association. The process concludes by pairing the shadow and object instances with their corresponding shadow-object associations.
- **SSIS** [109] introduces a single-stage fully convolutional network architecture with a bidirectional relation learning module for direct end-to-end learning of relations between shadow and object instances. This module delves into shadow-object association pairs, learning offset vectors from the center of each shadow instance to the center of its associated object instance, and the other way around.
- **SSISv2** [110] extends SSIS with novel techniques, including a deformable MaskIoU head, a shadow-aware copy-and-paste data augmentation strategy, and a boundary loss, aiming to enhance the segmentation of shadow/object instances and shadow-object associations.

3.2 Deep Models for Video Instance Shadow Detection

Video instance shadow detection entails not just identifying shadows and their associated objects in video frames, but also continuously tracking each shadow, object, and their associations throughout the entire video sequence, accommodating even temporary disappearance of shadow or object parts within associations.

- **ViShadow** [111] is a semi-supervised framework trained on labeled image data and unlabeled video sequences. Initial training involves pairing shadows and objects across different images using center contrastive learning. Subsequently, leveraging unlabeled videos with an associated cycle consistency loss enhances tracking. Also, it addresses the challenge of temporary disappearances of object or shadow instance by a retrieval mechanism.

3.3 Instance Shadow Detection Datasets

- **SOBA** [108], [110] is the first dataset for image instance shadow detection, comprising 1,100 images with 4,293 annotated shadow-object associations. Initially, 1,000 images were collected by [108], and [110] added 100 more images with challenging shadow-object pairs for exclusive testing. The training set includes 840 images with 2,999 pairs. The labels for shadow instances, object instances, and their associations are carefully annotated using Affinity Photo App with Apple Pencil.
- **SOBA-VID** [111] is a dataset crafted for video instance shadow detection, comprising 292 videos with a total of 7,045 frames. The dataset is divided into a training set of 232 videos (5,863 frames) and a test set of 60 videos (1,182 frames). Notably, the test set provides detailed frame-by-frame annotations for every shadow and object instance, while the training set includes annotations for one out of every four frames.

3.4 Evaluation Metrics

- **SOAP** [108], [110] (Shadow-Object Average Precision) assesses image instance shadow detection performance by computing average precision (AP) with intersection over union (IoU). It extends the criteria for true positives, requiring IoU thresholds for predicted and ground-truth shadow instances, object instances, and shadow-object associations to be greater than or equal to τ . Evaluation is conducted with a specific τ value of 0.5 (SOAP50) or 0.75 (SOAP75), and an average is computed across a range of τ values from 0.5 to 0.95 in increments of 0.05 (SOAP).
- **SOAP-VID** [111] assesses video instance shadow detection by substituting the IoU in SOAP with the spatio-temporal IoU.

3.5 Experimental Results

3.5.1 Evaluation of Image Instance Shadow Detection

Overall Performance Benchmark Results. SOAP [108], [110] is used as the dataset and SOBA is the evaluation metric. The methods compared are listed in Table 6. We re-train the methods using their original code, resizing the shorter side of input images during training to one of six sizes: 640, 672, 704, 736, 768, or 800. During inference, we resize the shorter side to 800, ensuring the longer side does not exceed 1333.

Table 6 shows the accuracy, running time, and parameters of each method, where we observe that (i) SSISv2 achieves the best performance but with the slowest speed; (ii) all have limited performance to deal with complex scenarios; and (iii) more

TABLE 7: Cross-dataset generalization evaluation. Models were trained on SOBA and tested on SOBA-VID.

Methods	$SOAP_{segm} \uparrow$	$SOAP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Asso. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{segm} \uparrow$	Ins. $AP_{bbox} \uparrow$
LISA [108]	22.6	21.1	44.2	53.6	39.0	37.3
SSIS [109]	32.1	26.6	58.6	64.0	46.4	41.0
SSISv2 [110]	37.0	26.7	63.6	67.5	51.8	42.8

instances in complex scenarios significantly reduce the inference speed. *See the visual comparisons in the supplementary material.*

Cross-Dataset Generalization Evaluation. To assess generalization capability, we conducted a cross-dataset evaluation by applying models trained on the SOBA training set to detect image instance shadows/objects in video frames of the SOBA-VID [111] testing set. Note that there are no temporal consistency evaluation.

Table 7 shows the results, where we observe that (i) the trend of the compared methods is consistent with the trend observed on the SOBA testing set, and (ii) the performance does not degrade significantly, demonstrating the powerful generalization capability of the instance shadow detection methods.

Summary. As demonstrated by the experimental results, *how to develop an efficient model for accurate segmentation of both shadow and object instances* remains a challenging problem.

3.5.2 Evaluation of Video Instance Shadow Detection

Here, we present the performance metrics of ViShadow [111] on the SOBA-VID test set: SOAP-VID at 39.6, Association AP at 61.5, and Instance AP at 50.9. The total inference time for 20 frames is 93.63 seconds, processing about 0.21 frames per second, with 66.26M model parameters.

4 SHADOW REMOVAL

Shadow removal aims to generate shadow-free images or video frames by recovering the colors under the shadows. Besides general scenes, document and facial shadow removal are important specific applications. This subsection presents a comprehensive overview of deep models on shadow removal and summarizes commonly-used datasets and metrics for evaluating shadow removal methods. Further, to assess the effectiveness of various methods, we conduct experiments and present comparative results.

4.1 Deep Models for Image Shadow Removal

Table 8 summarizes the surveyed papers on image shadow removal. We categorize the methods by supervision levels.

Supervised Learning. Here, the supervision is usually based on either (i) the shadow-free images or (ii) the shadow-free images and shadow masks.

(i) *CNN-based* methods:

- **CNN-CRF** [42] uses multiple CNNs to learn to detect shadows and constructs a Bayesian model to remove shadows. The deep networks are employed to only detect shadows.
- **DeshadowNet** [112] is an end-to-end network with three sub-networks to extract features from a global view of images.
- **SP+M-Net** [114] models the shadow image as a combination of a shadow-free image, shadow parameters, and a shadow matte, and then predicts the shadow parameters and shadow matte using two separate deep networks. In testing, it uses the shadow mask predicted from [54] as an additional input.
- **DSC** [50] introduces a direction-aware spatial context (DSC) module to analyze image context with directional awareness. A CNN with multiple DSC modules [49] generates residuals that are combined with the inputs to produce shadow-free images.
- **DHAN+DA** [116] presents the hierarchical aggregation attention model with multi-contexts and the attention loss from shadow masks, and synthesizes shadow images from various shadow masks and shadow-free images using the network of **Shadow Matting GAN**.
- **SP+M+I-Net** [118] extends [114] by constraining SP-Net and M-Net’s search spaces, adding a penumbra reconstruction loss to help M-Net attend to shadow penumbra regions, utilizing I-Net for inpainting, and introducing a smoothness loss to regulate the matte layer. It can be extended for patch-based weakly-supervised shadow removal [117].
- **Auto** [119] matches shadow regions with non-shadowed areas in color to generate overexposed images, which are merged with the input via a shadow-aware FusionNet to produce an adaptive kernel weight map. Last, a boundary-aware RefineNet reduces remaining penumbra effects along shadow boundaries.
- **CANet** [122] uses a two-stage context-aware approach: first adopts a contextual patch matching module to find potential shadow and non-shadow patch pairs, facilitating information transfer from non-shadow to shadow areas across different scales, and employs an encoder-decoder to refine and finalize.
- **EMDNet** [125] proposes a model-driven network for shadow removal iterative optimization. Each stage updates the transformation map and shadow-free image.
- **BMNet** [127] is a bijective mapping network that integrates shadow removal and shadow generation sharing parameters. It features invertible blocks for affine transformations and includes a shadow-invariant color guidance module that leverages U-Net-derived shadow-invariant colors for color restoration.
- **G2C-DeshadowNet** [128] is a two-stage shadow removal framework that first removes shadows from grayscale images and colorizes them utilizing modified self-attention blocks to optimize global image information.
- **SG-ShadowNet** [129] is a two-part style-guided shadow removal network: a U-Net-based coarse deshadow network for initial shadow processing and a style-guided re-deshadow network for refining outcomes, employing a spatially region-aware prototypical normalization layer to render the non-shadow region style to the shadow region.
- **MStructNet** [133] reconstructs the structural information of input images to remove shadows, harnessing a shadow-free structural prior for image-level shadow eradication and engaging multi-level structural insights.
- **DNSR** [137] is a U-Net-based architecture, featuring dynamic convolution, exposure adjustment, and a distillation phase to enhance feature maps. It integrates channel attention and fused pooling for improved feature blending.
- **PES** [139] uses pyramid inputs for various shadow sizes and shapes, with NAFNet [153] as the base framework. A three-stage training process with varying input and crop sizes, loss functions, batch sizes, and iteration numbers, refined with a model soup [154], achieved the highest PSNR in the NTIRE 2023 Image Shadow Removal Challenge on the WSRD.

TABLE 8: Deep models for image shadow removal. \$ denotes using additional training data.

Years	#	Methods	Publications	Backbones	Supervision Levels	Training Data
2016	[42]	CNN-CRF	TPAMI	7-layer network	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2017	[112]	DeshadowNet	CVPR	VGG16	Fully supervised	Paired
2018	[48]	ST-CGAN	CVPR	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2019	[113]	AngularGAN	CVPRW	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired
2019	[56]	ARGAN/ARGAN+SS\$	ICCV	18-layer U-Net	Fully/Semi-supervised	Paired + Mask
2019	[114]	SP+M-Net	ICCV	ResNeXt+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2019	[104]	Mask-ShadowGAN	ICCV	14-layer network	Unsupervised	Unpaired
2020	[50]	DSC	TPAMI	VGG16	Fully supervised	Paired
2020	[115]	RIS-GAN	AAAI	DenseUNet	Fully supervised	Paired
2020	[116]	DHAN+DA	AAAI	VGG16	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2020	[117]	Param+M+D-Net	ECCV	VGG19	Weakly supervised	Shadow Image + Mask
2021	[118]	SP+M+I-Net	TPAMI	ResNeXt+U-Net+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2021	[119]	Auto	CVPR	ResNeXt+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2021	[120]	G2R-ShadowNet	CVPR	14-layer network	Weakly supervised	Shadow Image + Mask
2021	[121]	PUL	CVPRW	14-layer network	Unsupervised	Unpaired
2021	[122]	CANet	ICCV	DenseNet+DenseUNet	Fully supervised	Paired
2021	[123]	DC-ShadowNet	ICCV	14-layer network	Unsupervised	Unpaired
2021	[124]	LG-ShadowNet	TIP	14-layer+SqueezeNet	Unsupervised	Unpaired
2022	[125]	EMDNet	AAAI	U-Net(MobileNetv2+ResNet)	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[126]	CRFormer	arXiv	Transformer+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[127]	BMNet	CVPR	Resblocks+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[128]	G2C-DeshadowNet	CVPRW	Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[129]	SG-ShadowNet	ECCV	U-Net(residual)	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[130]	CNSNet	ECCVW	U-Net+TransformerBlocks	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2022	[131]	ShadowDiffusion(J)	arXiv	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired
2023	[132]	ShadowDiffusion(G)	CVPR	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[133]	MStructNet	TIP	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[134]	Self-ShadowGAN	IJCV	3-layer conv + 5-layer MLPs	Self-supervised	Single Image + Mask
2023	[135]	ShadowFormer	AAAI	Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[136]	SpA-Former	IJCNN	ResBlocks+TransformerBlocks	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[137]	DNSR	CVPRW	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[138]	TSRFormer	CVPRW	SpA-Former+ShadowFormer	Fully supervised	Paired
2023	[139]	PES	CVPRW	NAFNet	Fully supervised	Paired
2023	[140]	BCDiff	ICCV	Uformer	Weakly supervised	Shadow Image + Mask
2023	[141]	Inpaint4shadow\$	ICCV	Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[69]	LRA&LDRA\$	WACV	-	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[142]	SHARDS	WACV	Encoder-Decoder+CBAM	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2023	[143]	TBRNet	TNNLS	VGG19	Fully supervised	Paired
2024	[144]	PRNet	CVIU	ResNet+ConvGRUs	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2024	[145]	DeS3	AAAI	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired
2024	[146]	Recasting	AAAI	Encoder-Decoder+U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2024	[147]	LFG-Diffusion	WACV	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2024	[148]	ShadowMaskFormer	arXiv	Swin Transformer	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2024	[149]	ShadowRefiner	CVPRW	ConvNeXt+Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired
2024	[150]	HomoFormer	CVPR	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask
2024	[151]	SG-GAN+DBRM	arXiv	Mask-ShadowGAN+U-Net	Unsupervised	Unpaired
2024	[152]	Diff-Shadow	arXiv	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired + Mask

- **Inpaint4shadow** [141] reduces shadow remnants by pretraining on inpainting datasets, utilizing dual encoders for shadow and shadow-masked images, a weighted fusion module to merge features, and a decoder to generate shadow-free images.
- **LRA&LDRA** [69] improves shadow detection and removal by optimizing residuals in a stacked framework [48]. It reconstructs shadow regions using blending and color correction. It demonstrates that pre-training on a large-scale synthetic dataset containing paired shadow images, shadow-free images, and shadow masks significantly enhances performance.
- **SHARDS** [142] removes shadows from high-resolution images using two networks: LSRNet generates a low-resolution shadow-free image from the shadow image and its mask, while DRNet refines details using the original high-resolution shadow image. This design keeps DRNet lightweight, as LSRNet handles the main shadow removal at a lower resolution.
- **PRNet** [144] combines shadow feature extraction via a shallow six-block ResNet with progressive shadow removal through re-integration modules and ConvGRU-based updates [155]. The re-integration module iteratively enhances outputs, and the update module generates shadow-attenuated features for prediction.
- (ii) *GAN-based* methods adopt the generator to predict shadow-free images and the discriminator for judgement.
 - **ST-CGAN** [48] uses one conditional GAN to detect shadows and leverages another conditional GAN to remove shadows.
 - **AngularGAN** [113] uses a GAN to predict shadow-free images end-to-end. The network is trained on synthetic paired data.
 - **ARGAN** [56] first develops a shadow attention detector to generate an attention map to mark the shadows and then recurrently recovers a shadow-lighter or shadow-free image. Note that it can be trained in a **semi-supervised** manner using unlabeled data with the adversarial loss in a GAN.
 - **RIS-GAN** [115] adopts four generators in the encoder-decoder structure and three discriminators to generate negative residual images, intermediate shadow-removal images, inverse illumination maps, and refined shadow-removal images.
 - **TBRNet** [143] is a three-branch network with multitask cooperation. It consists of three specialized branches: shadow image reconstruction to preserve input image details; shadow matte estimation to identify shadow locations and adjust illumination; and shadow removal to align the lighting of shadow areas with non-shadow ones to produce a shadow-free image.

(iii) *Transformer-based* methods better capture global contextual information by the self-attention mechanism.

- **CRFormer** [126] is a hybrid CNN-Transformer framework, with asymmetrical CNNs to extract features from shadow and non-shadow areas, a region-aware cross-attention mechanism to aggregate shadow region features, and a U-shaped network to refine the results.
- **CNSNet** [130] uses a dual approach for shadow removal, integrating shadow-oriented adaptive normalization for statistical consistency between shadow and non-shadow areas, and shadow-aware aggregation with Transformer to connect pixels across shadow and non-shadow areas.
- **ShadowFormer** [135] uses a channel attention encoder-decoder framework with a shadow-interaction attention mechanism, analyzing correlations between shadow and non-shadow patches using contextual information.
- **SpA-Former** [136] consists of Transformer layers, a series of joint Fourier transform residual blocks [156], and two-wheel joint spatial attentions. The two-wheel joint spatial attention is same as DSC [49], [50] but trained with shadow masks.
- **TSRFormer** [138] is a two-stage architecture, employing distinct Transformer models for global shadow removal and content refinement, which helps to suppress the residual shadow and refine the content information. SpA-Former [136] and ShadowFormer [135] serve as their backbones.
- **ShadowMaskFormer** [148] integrates the Transformer model with a shadow mask in patch embedding. It employs 0/1 and -1/+1 binarization to amplify the pixels in shadow regions.
- **ShadowRefiner** [149] uses a ConvNeXt-based U-Net for extracting spatial and frequency representations to map shadow-affected to shadow-free images. It then features a fast Fourier attention Transformer for color and structure consistency.
- **HomoFormer** [150] is a local window-based Transformer for shadow removal that homogenizes shadow degradation. It uses random shuffle operations and their inverse to rearrange pixels, allowing the local self-attention layer to process shadows effectively and eliminate inductive bias [157]. A new feed-forward network with depth-wise convolution enhances position modeling and exploits image structures.

(iv) *Diffusion-based* methods help produce even more visually-pleasant results.

- **ShadowDiffusion(J)** [131] uses classifier-driven attention for shadow detection, structure preservation loss with DINO-ViT features for reconstructions, and chromaticity consistency loss to ensure uniform colors in areas without shadows.
- **ShadowDiffusion(G)** [132] incrementally refines the output through degradation and diffusive generative priors, and enhances the accuracy of shadow mask estimation as an auxiliary aspect of the diffusion generator.
- **DeS3** [145] removes hard, soft, and self shadows using adaptive attention and ViT similarity mechanisms. It employs DDIM [158] as the generative model and utilizes adaptive classifier-driven attention to emphasize shadow regions, with the DINO-ViT loss acting as the stopping criterion during inference.
- **Recasting** [146] has two stages: a shadow-aware decomposition network separates reflectance and illumination using self-supervised regularizations, and a bilateral correction network adjusts lighting in shadow areas with a local lighting correction module. It then progressively restores degraded texture details with an illumination-guided texture restoration module.

- **LFG-Diffusion** [147] trains a diffusion network on shadow-free images to learn shadow-free priors in a latent feature space. It then uses these pretrained weights for efficient shadow removal, minimizing the invariant loss between encoded shadow-free and shadow images with masks, while enhancing interactions between latent noise variables and the diffusion network.
- **Diff-Shadow** [152] is a global-guided diffusion model with parallel U-Nets: a local branch for patch noise estimation and a global branch for shadow-free image recovery. It uses the re-weight cross attention and global-guided sampling to explore global context from non-shadow regions and to determine fusion weights for patch noise, preserving illumination consistency.

Unsupervised Learning. This category of methods trains the deep network without using paired shadow and shadow-free images, which are difficult to obtain.

- **Mask-ShadowGAN** [104] is the first unsupervised shadow removal method, which automatically learns to produce a shadow mask from the input shadow image and takes the mask to guide the shadow generation via re-formulated cycle-consistency constraints. The framework simultaneously learns to produce shadow masks and remove shadows.
- **PUL** [121] improves Mask-ShadowGAN with four additional losses: mask loss (L1 difference between sampled and generated masks), color loss (MSE between smoothed images), content loss (feature loss from VGG-16), and style loss (Gram matrix of VGG-16 features).
- **DC-ShadowNet** [123] handles shadow regions using a shadow/shadow-free domain classifier. It is trained with a physics-based shadow-free chromaticity loss from entropy minimization in log-chromaticity space, a shadow-robust perceptual features loss with pre-trained VGG-16, a boundary smoothness loss, and some additional losses like Mask-ShadowGAN.
- **LG-ShadowNet** [124] improves Mask-ShadowGAN using a lightness-guided network. In Lab color space, a CNN first adjusts lightness in the L channel, then another CNN uses these features for shadow removal in all Lab channels. Multi-layer connections blend lightness and shadow removal features in a dual-stream architecture.
- **SG-GAN+DBRM** [151] has two networks. (i) SG-GAN, based on Mask-ShadowGAN [104], produces coarse shadow removal results and synthetic paired data, guided by a multi-modal semantic prompter using CLIP [167] for text-based semantics. (ii) DBRM, a diffusion model, refines the coarse results and this model is trained on real shadow-free images and shadow-removed images, with shadows in the before-removal images synthesized by Mask-ShadowGAN.

Weakly Supervised Learning. This category trains the deep network only using the shadow images and shadow masks. The shadow masks can be predicted by the shadow detection methods.

- **Param+M+D-Net** [117] trains on shadow images using shadow segmentation masks as supervision. It divides images into patches, learns mappings from shadow-boundary patches to non-shadow patches, and applies constraints based on a physical shadow formation model.
- **G2R-ShadowNet** [120] has three sub-networks: generating, removing, and refining shadows. The shadow-generation network creates pseudo shadows in non-shadow areas, forming training pairs with non-shadow regions for the shadow-removal

TABLE 9: Deep models for document and facial shadow removal.

Applications	Years	#	Methods	Publications	Backbones	Supervision Levels	Training Data
Document	2020	[159]	BEDSR-Net	CVPR	U-Net	Fully supervised	Paired Data
Document	2023	[160]	BGShadowNet	CVPR	U-Net+DenseUnet	Fully supervised	Paired Data
Document	2023	[161]	FSENet	ICCV	-	Fully supervised	Paired Data
Facial	2020	[162]	Zhang et al.	SIGGRAPH	GridNet	Fully supervised	Paired Data
Facial	2021	[163]	He et al.	ACM MM	StyleGAN2 + U-Net	Unsupervised	Shadow Images
Facial	2022	[164]	GS+C	BMVC	Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired Data
Facial (Eyeglasses)	2022	[165]	Lyu et al.	CVPR	Encoder-Decoder	Fully supervised	Paired Data + Mask
Facial	2023	[166]	GraphFFNet	CGF (PG)	-	Fully supervised	Paired Data

network. The refinement phase ensures color and illumination consistency. Shadow masks guide the entire process.

- **BCDiff** [140] is a boundary-aware conditional diffusion model. It enhances an unconditional diffusion model by iteratively maintaining reflectance, supported by a shadow-invariant intrinsic decomposition model, to preserve structures within shadow regions. It also applies an illumination consistency constraint for uniform lighting. The base network used is Uformer [168].

Self-Supervised Learning on a Single Image. This task learns to remove shadows from an image by training on the image itself during testing, eliminating the need for training data. However, shadow masks are required.

- **Self-ShadowGAN** [134] employs a shadow relighting network as the generator for shadow removal, supported by two discriminators. The relighting network uses lightweight MLPs to predict pixel-specific shadow relighting coefficients based on a physical model, with parameters determined by a fast convolutional network. It also includes a histogram-based discriminator that uses histograms from shadow-free areas as reference for restoring illumination in shadow areas, and a patch-based discriminator for improving texture quality in deshadowed regions.

4.1.1 Document Shadow Removal

Removing shadows in documents improves the visual quality and readability of digital copies. General shadow removal methods face challenges in handling documents, due to the need for a large paired dataset and the lack of considering specific document image properties. Table 9 summarizes deep models for this task.

- **BEDSR-Net** [159] is the first deep network designed for document image shadow removal. It consists of two sub-networks: BE-Net estimates the global background color and generates an attention map. These, along with the input shadow image, are used by SR-Net to produce the shadow-free image.
- **BGShadowNet** [160] leverages backgrounds from a color-aware background extraction network for shadow removal in a two-stage process. First, it fuses background and image features to generate realistic initial results. Second, it corrects illumination and color inconsistencies using a background-based attention module and enhances low-level details with a detail enhancement module, inspired by image histogram equalization.
- **FSENet** [161] aims for high-resolution document shadow removal by first splitting images into low- and high-frequency components. The low-frequency part uses a Transformer for illumination adjustments, while the high-frequency part uses cascaded aggregations and dilated convolutions to enhance pixels and recover textures.

4.1.2 Facial Shadow Removal

Facial shadow removal involves eliminating external shadows, softening facial shadows, and balancing lighting. Table 9 summarizes the deep models. This topic is also related to face

relighting [169], as accurate shadow manipulation is crucial for photo-realistic results. Additionally, removing shadows improves the robustness of facial landmark detection [170].

- **Zhang et al.** [162] present the first deep-learning-based method tailored for facial image shadow removal. It uses two separate deep models: one for removing foreign shadows cast by external objects and another for softening the facial shadows. Both models are based on the modified GridNet [171], [172].
- **He et al.** [163] present the first unsupervised facial shadow removal method by framing it as an image decomposition task. It processes a single shadowed portrait to produce a shadow-free image, a full-shadow image, and a shadow mask, using the pretrained face generators like StyleGAN2 and the face segmentation masks.
- **GS+C** [164] removes shadows by splitting it into grayscale processing and colorization. Shadows are identified and removed in grayscale, then colors are restored through inpainting. To maintain consistency across video frames, it includes a temporal sharing module that addresses pose and expression variations.
- **Lyu et al.** [165] present a two-stage model to remove eyeglasses together with their shadows. The first stage predicts masks using a cross-domain segmentation module, while the second stage uses these masks to guide a deshadow and deglass network. The model is trained on synthetic data and uses a domain adaptation network for real images.
- **GraphFFNet** [166] is a graph-based feature fusion network for removing shadows from facial images. It employs a multi-scale encoder to extract local features, an image flipper to leverage facial symmetry for a coarse shadow-less image, and a graph-based convolution encoder to identify global relationships. A feature modulation module combines these global and local features, and a fusion decoder generates the shadow-free image.

4.2 Deep Models for Video Shadow Removal

- **PSTNet** [173] is a video shadow removal method, combining physical, spatial, and temporal features, supervised by shadow-free images and masks. It uses a physical branch for adaptive exposure and supervised attention, and spatial and temporal branches for resolution and coherence. A feature fusion module refines outputs, and an S2R strategy adapts the synthetically trained model for real-world use without retraining.
- **GS+C** [164] performs facial shadow removal in videos. See Section 4.1.2 for details.

4.3 Shadow Removal Datasets

4.3.1 General Image Shadow Removal Datasets

- **SRD** [112] is the first large-scale shadow removal dataset with 3,088 shadow and shadow-free image pairs. The dataset’s diversity spans four dimensions: illumination (hard and soft shadows), a wide range of scenes (parks to beaches), varying




Fig. 2: Shadow removal methods on the SRD (left) and ISTD+ (right) datasets: accuracy, parameters (indicated by the area of the bubbles), and speed.

reflectance by casting shadows on different objects, and diverse silhouettes and penumbra widths using occluders of different shapes. The shadow masks of SRD are newly labeled by [146].

- **ISTD** [48] & **ISTD+** [114]: Both consist of shadow images, shadow-free images, and shadow masks, with 1,330 training images and 540 testing images from 135 unique background scenes. ISTD suffers from color and luminosity inconsistencies between shadow and shadow-free images [50], [114], which ISTD+ corrects with a color compensation mechanism to ensure uniform pixel colors across the ground-truth images.
- **GTAV** [113] is a synthetic dataset of 5,723 shadow and shadow-free image pairs. The scenes are rendered from the video game GTAV by Rockstar, depicting real-world-like scenes in two editions: with and without shadows. It includes 5,110 standard daylight scenes and an additional 613 indoor and night scenes.
- **USR** [104] is designed for unpaired shadow removal tasks, containing 2,511 images featuring shadows and 1,772 images without shadows. This dataset encompasses a wide array of scenes, showcasing shadows cast by a diverse range of objects. It spans over a thousand unique scenes, offering a substantial variety for research in shadow removal technologies.
- **SFHQ** [142], Shadow Food-HQ, consists of 14,520 high-resolution food images (12MP) with annotated shadow masks. It includes diverse scenes under various lighting and perspectives, divided into 14,000 training and 520 testing triplets.
- **WSRD** [137] was created in a controlled indoor setting with directional and diffuse lighting. It features 1,200 high-resolution (1920x1440) image pairs: 1,000 for training, 100 for validation, and 100 for testing. The dataset includes surfaces of various colors, textures, and geometries, and objects of different thicknesses, heights, depths, and materials, including opaque, translucent, and transparent types. It was used by 19 teams in the NTIRE23 challenge for image shadow removal [174].

4.3.2 General Video Shadow Removal Datasets

- **SBU-Timelapse** [118] is a video shadow removal dataset with 50 videos of static scenes, featuring only shifting shadows and no-moving objects. A pseudo shadow-free frame is derived from each video using the “max-min” technique.
- **SVSRD-85** [173] is a synthetic video shadow removal dataset from GTAV. It contains 85 videos with 4,250 frames, collected by toggling the shadow renderer. The dataset covers various object categories and motion/illumination conditions, with each frame paired with shadow-free images.

4.3.3 Document Shadow Removal Datasets

- **SDSRD** [159] is a synthetic dataset created with Blender, containing 970 document images and 8,309 synthesized shadow

images under different lighting and occluders. It includes 7,533 training triplets and 776 testing triplets.

- **RDSRD** [159] is a real dataset captured by cameras. The dataset comprises 540 images featuring 25 documents with shadow images, shadow-free images, and shadow masks. This dataset is used only for evaluation.
- **RDD** [160] uses document backgrounds such as papers, books, and pamphlets. It consists of 4,916 image pairs, each captured with and without shadows by positioning and then removing an occluder. 4,371 pairs are for training and 545 for testing.
- **SD7K** [161] contains 7,620 pairs of high-resolution real-world document images with and without shadows, along with annotated shadow masks. It includes various document types (manga, papers, figures), 30+ occluders, and 350+ documents captured under three lighting conditions (cool, warm, and sunlight).

4.3.4 Facial Shadow Removal Datasets

- **UCB** [162] comprises synthesized foreign and facial shadows. Foreign shadows are created by blending lit and shadowed images using shadow masks on a dataset of 5,000 faces without foreign shadows; however, eyeglass shadows are considered inherent. Facial shadows are generated from Light Stage [175] scans of 85 subjects across various expressions and poses, using weighted one-light-at-a-time combinations.
- **SFW** [164] is assembled for facial shadow removal in real-world conditions, consisting of 280 videos from 20 subjects, with most videos recorded in 1080p resolution. Labels are provided for various shadow masks, such as cast shadows, self-shadows, bright or saturated face regions, and eyeglasses, across 440 frames.
- **PSE** [165], Portrait Synthesis with Eyeglasses, is a synthetic dataset by 3D rendering. It simulates 3D eyeglasses on face scans using node-based registration, rendering them under various illuminations to produce four image types with masks. From 438 identities, 73 are chosen, each with 20 expression scans, paired with five eyeglass styles and four HDR lighting conditions, generating 29,200 training samples.

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

- **RMSE**¹ [21] calculates the root-mean-square error in the LAB color space between the ground-truth shadow-free image and the recovered image, ensuring local perceptual uniformity.
 - **LPIPS** [176] (Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity) assesses the perceptual distance between image patches, where a higher score indicates lower similarity and vice versa. This paper adopts VGG [177] as the feature extractor in LPIPS.
- SSIM** [178] and **PSNR** are sometimes used in evaluation.

4.5 Experimental Results

4.5.1 General Image Shadow Removal

Overall Performance Benchmark Results. Two widely-used datasets, SRD [112] and ISTD+ [114], are adopted to assess the performance of shadow removal methods. Methods compared are listed in Table 10, and we excluded those for which the code is not available. We re-trained the compared methods using their original code, setting the input sizes to 256×256 and 512×512 to report results at two resolutions. For DSC [50], we transferred the

1. Some previous works use code that mistakenly computes the MAE (mean absolute error). This paper corrects that issue.

TABLE 10: Comparing image shadow removal methods on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. LPIPS uses the VGG as the extractor. Please note that for the results shown in the rightmost columns, we report the cross-dataset generalization evaluation, where the models were trained on SRD and tested on DESOBA. Note that *Mask-ShadowGAN* and *DC-ShadowNet* are unsupervised methods, and *G2R-ShadowNet* is a weakly-supervised method.

Input Size	Methods	SRD				ISTD+				Param.(M)	Infer.(images/s)	DESOBA (cross)	
		RMSE↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	RMSE↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓			RMSE↓	PSNR↑
256 × 256	ST-CGAN [48]	4.15	25.08	0.637	0.443	3.77	25.74	0.691	0.408	58.49	111.79	7.07	20.23
	SP+M-Net [114]	5.68	22.25	0.636	0.444	3.37	26.58	0.717	0.373	54.42	33.88	5.10	23.35
	Mask-ShadowGAN [104]	4.32	24.67	0.662	0.427	3.70	25.50	0.720	0.377	22.76	64.77	6.94	20.47
	DSC [50]	3.97	25.46	0.678	0.412	3.44	26.53	0.738	0.347	122.49	57.40	6.66	20.71
	Auto [119]	5.37	23.20	0.694	0.370	3.53	26.10	0.718	0.365	196.76	33.23	5.88	22.62
	G2R-ShadowNet [120]	6.08	21.72	0.619	0.460	4.37	24.23	0.696	0.396	22.76	3.62	5.13	23.14
	DC-ShadowNet [123]	4.27	24.72	0.670	0.383	3.89	25.18	0.693	0.406	10.59	40.51	6.88	20.58
	BMNet [127]	4.39	24.24	0.721	0.327	3.34	26.62	0.731	0.354	0.58	17.42	5.37	22.75
	SG-ShadowNet [129]	4.60	24.10	0.636	0.443	3.32	26.80	0.717	0.369	6.17	16.51	4.92	23.36
	ShadowDiffusion(G) [132]	4.84	23.26	0.684	0.363	3.44	26.51	0.688	0.404	55.52	9.73	5.59	22.08
	ShadowFormer [135]	4.44	24.28	0.715	0.348	3.45	26.55	0.728	0.350	11.37	32.57	5.01	23.49
	ShadowMaskFormer [148]	4.69	23.85	0.671	0.386	3.39	26.57	0.698	0.395	2.28	17.63	5.82	22.14
	HomoFormer [150]	4.17	24.64	0.723	0.325	3.37	26.72	0.732	0.348	17.81	16.14	5.02	23.41
	512 × 512	ST-CGAN [48]	3.44	26.95	0.786	0.282	3.36	27.32	0.829	0.252	58.49	52.84	6.65
SP+M-Net [114]		4.35	24.89	0.792	0.269	2.96	28.31	0.866	0.183	54.42	24.48	4.57	24.80
Mask-ShadowGAN [104]		3.83	25.98	0.803	0.270	3.42	26.51	0.865	0.196	22.76	52.70	6.74	20.96
DSC [50]		3.29	27.39	0.802	0.263	2.75	28.85	0.861	0.196	122.49	31.37	5.58	22.61
Auto [119]		4.71	24.32	0.800	0.247	2.99	28.07	0.853	0.189	196.76	28.28	5.05	24.16
G2R-ShadowNet [120]		5.72	22.44	0.765	0.302	3.31	27.13	0.841	0.221	22.76	2.50	4.60	24.56
DC-ShadowNet [123]		3.68	26.47	0.808	0.255	3.64	26.06	0.835	0.234	10.59	39.45	6.62	21.25
BMNet [127]		4.00	25.39	0.820	0.225	3.06	27.74	0.848	0.212	0.58	17.49	5.06	23.65
SG-ShadowNet [129]		4.01	25.56	0.786	0.279	2.98	28.25	0.849	0.205	6.17	8.12	4.47	24.53
ShadowDiffusion(G) [132]		5.11	23.09	0.804	0.240	3.10	27.87	0.839	0.222	55.52	2.96	5.50	22.34
ShadowFormer [135]		3.90	25.60	0.819	0.228	3.06	28.07	0.847	0.204	11.37	23.32	4.55	24.81
ShadowMaskFormer [148]		4.15	25.13	0.798	0.249	2.95	28.34	0.849	0.211	2.28	14.25	5.51	23.11
HomoFormer [150]		3.62	26.21	0.827	0.219	2.88	28.53	0.857	0.196	17.81	12.60	4.42	24.89

code from Caffe to PyTorch and used a ResNeXt101 backbone. ShadowDiffusion(G) [132] uses pretrained Uformer [168] weights for ISTD+ inference. For methods requiring shadow masks as inputs, *unlike several previous methods using predicted shadow masks during the training, we adopt well-labeled masks in both SRD and ISTD+.* *Unlike certain previous methods that rely on ground-truth masks during inference (may lead to data leakage), we employ shadow masks generated by the SDDNet detector [70].* The detector is trained on the SBU dataset at a 512×512 resolution, which shows superior generalization, as shown in Table 3. The employed evaluation metrics include RMSE, PSNR, SSIM, and LPIPS. *Results are resized to match the ground-truth resolution in evaluation for a fair comparison. Some papers that resize the ground truth are incorrect, as this distorts details and leads to biased, less accurate evaluations of image quality.*

Table 10 and Fig. 2 summarize the accuracy², runtime, and model complexity of each method. Key insights include: (i) early methods such as DSC and ST-CGAN outperform later approaches across several evaluation metrics; (ii) unsupervised methods demonstrate performance comparable to supervised ones on SRD and ISTD+, likely due to the similar background textures in the training and test sets, with Mask-ShadowGAN offering the best trade-off between effectiveness and efficiency; (iii) smaller models like BMNet (0.58M) provide competitive performance without significant increases in model size; and (iv) most methods show improved results at higher resolutions, such as 512×512 . *See the visual comparisons in the supplementary material.*

Cross-Dataset Generalization Evaluation. To assess the generalization capability of shadow removal methods, we conduct cross-dataset evaluations using models trained on the SRD training set to detect shadows on the combination of DESOBA (see Sec. 5.2.1) training and testing sets. Both datasets contain outdoor

2. Some results differ significantly from the original reports due to our use of the consistent input size, evaluation code, and safeguards against data leakage.

TABLE 11: Comparing document shadow removal methods on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. VGG is used in LPIPS.

Methods	RMSE↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	Param.(M)	Infer.(images/s)
BEDSR-Net [159]	3.13	28.480	0.912	0.171	32.21	10.41
FSENet [161]	2.46	31.251	0.948	0.161	29.40	19.37

scenes, but SRD lacks occluders casting shadows, while DESOBA presents more complex environments. This marks the first large-scale evaluation of generalization on such a challenging dataset. Note that DESOBA only labels *cast shadows* and we set the self shadows on objects as “don’t care” in evaluation. SSIM and LPIPS are excluded, as SSIM depends on image windows and LPIPS uses network activations, both conflicting with the “don’t care” policy.

The two rightmost columns in Table 10 show that models performing well on controlled datasets like SRD and ISTD+ struggle in the more complex environments of DESOBA. This is because SRD mainly features cast shadows in simpler, localized scenes with softer shadows and no occluders, whereas DESOBA presents more intricate scenes with harder shadows and occlusions. This highlights the need for diverse training data and more adaptable models capable of handling real-world shadow scenarios.

Summary. As demonstrated by the experimental results, *how to develop a robust model and prepare a representative dataset that delivers high performance for image shadow removal in complex scenarios, remains a challenging problem.*

4.5.2 Document Shadow Removal

The RDD [160] dataset is used to train and evaluate the document shadow removal methods and the input size is 512×512 . The results are shown in Table 11, where we observe that FSENet significantly outperforms BEDSR-Net in both accuracy and efficiency, making it the superior method across all metrics.

TABLE 12: Deep models for image shadow generation.

Years	#	Methods	Publications	Supervision Levels	Learning Paradigm	Applications
2019	[179]	ShadowGAN	CVM	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2019	[104]	Mask-ShadowGAN	ICCV	Unsupervised	Multi-task	Shadow Removal
2020	[180]	ARShadowGAN	CVPR	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2020	[181]	Zheng <i>et al.</i>	CVPR	Fully supervised	Single-task	Sketch
2020	[116]	Shadow Matting GAN	AAAI	Fully supervised	Single-task	Shadow Removal
2021	[182]	SSN	CVPR	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2021	[120]	G2R-ShadowNet	CVPR	Weakly supervised	Multi-task	Shadow Removal
2021	[183]	SmartShadow	ICCV	Fully supervised	Single-task	Sketch
2022	[184]	SSG	ECCV	Fully supervised	Multi-task	Composition
2022	[185]	SGRNet	AAAI	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2022	[186]	Liu <i>et al.</i>	EITCE	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2023	[187]	PixHt-Lab	CVPR	Fully supervised	Multi-task	Composition
2023	[188]	HAU-Net & IFNet	TMM	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2023	[189]	Valença <i>et al.</i>	SIGGRAPH Asia	Fully supervised	Multi-task	Composition
2024	[190]	DMASNet	AAAI	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition
2024	[191]	SGDiffusion	CVPR	Fully supervised	Single-task	Composition

5 SHADOW GENERATION

Shadow generation serves three main purposes: (i) image composition, which involves generating cast shadows for objects in photos such that one can insert or reposition objects in photos; (ii) data augmentation, which aims to create cast shadows in images to produce photo-realistic images to support deep neural network training; and (iii) sketching, which focuses on generating shadows for hand-drawn sketches to accelerate the drawing process.

5.1 Deep Models for Image Shadow Generation

5.1.1 Shadow Generation for Image Composition

- **ShadowGAN** [179] uses a GAN to craft realistic shadows for virtual objects in images. It features a generator and dual discriminators, ensuring shadows are appropriately shaped and harmonized with the scene’s global lighting.
- **ARshadowGAN** [180] is a GAN model that adds shadows to virtual objects in augmented reality under single light conditions. It uses an attention mechanism to simplify shadow generation by modeling the relation between virtual object shadows and their real-world counterparts, without estimating illumination or 3D geometry.
- **SSN** [182] offers a real-time interactive system for creating controllable soft shadows in photos using 2D object masks. It uses dynamic shadow generation and environmental light maps to train its network, resulting in varied soft shadow data. Also, it predicts ambient occlusion to enhance realism.
- **SSG** [184] introduces pixel height, a novel geometry representation that enables precise control over shadow direction and shape in image compositing. This method uses projective geometry for hard shadow calculation and includes a trained U-Net to add softness to the shadows.
- **SGRNet** [185] is a two-stage network, which first employs a generator to create a shadow mask by merging foreground and background, and then predicts shadow parameters and fills the shadow area, producing an image with realistic shadows.
- **Liu *et al.*** [186] enhances shadow generation in image compositing with multi-scale feature enhancement and multi-level feature fusion. This approach improves mask prediction accuracy and minimizes information loss in shadow parameter prediction, leading to enhanced shadow shapes and ranges.
- **PixHt-Lab** [187] maps pixel heights to 3D space to create realistic lighting effects like shadows and reflections. It overcomes traditional 2D limitations by reconstructing 3D geometry of the

cutout and background, using 3D-aware buffer channels and a neural renderer for improved quality of soft shadows.

- **HAU-Net & IFNet** [188] consist of two components: hierarchy attention U-Net (HAU-Net) for inferring background illumination and predicting shadow shapes for foreground objects; and illumination-aware fusion network (IFNet), which uses an enhanced illumination model to blend under-exposed shadow regions, creating more natural-looking shadows.
- **Valença *et al.*** [189] enhance shadow integration when editing photos by addressing the interaction between real ground shadows and projections onto virtual entities. Their generator creates a shadow gain map and a shadow mask from a virtual shadow and scene image, followed by post-processing with lighting and camera parameters for seamless integration.
- **DMASNet** [190] is a two-stage approach to generate realistic shadows. The first stage breaks down the task into box and shape predictions to form an initial shadow mask, which is then refined for enhanced details. The second stage attentively fills the shadow, adjusting for local illumination variations for seamless blend with the background.
- **SGDiffusion** [191] uses the stable diffusion model enriched with knowledge of natural shadow images to overcome difficulties related to accurate shadow shape and intensity generation. Specifically, it enhances shadow intensity through the ControlNet [101] adaptation and intensity modulation modules.

5.1.2 Shadow Generation for Shadow Removal

See **Mask-ShadowGAN** [104], **Shadow Matting GAN** [116], and **G2R-ShadowNet** [120] in Section 4.1.

5.1.3 Shadow Generation for Sketch

- **Zheng *et al.*** [181] create detailed artistic shadows from hand-drawn sketches using specified lighting directions. They build a 3D model in latent space and render shadows that align with the sketch’s lines and 3D structure, including self-shadowing and artistic effects like rim lighting.
- **SmartShadow** [183] assists digital artists in adding shadows to line drawings with three tools: a shadow brush for initial placement, a shadow boundary brush for edge precision control, and a global shadow generator for consistent shadow direction. Using CNNs, it predicts global shadow direction and shadow maps from sketch input and user guidance.

5.2 Shadow Generation Datasets

5.2.1 Shadow Generation Datasets for Image Composition

- **Shadow-AR** [180] is a synthesized dataset of 3,000 quintuples, each including a synthetic image with and without a rendered shadow, a binary mask of the synthetic object, a labeled real-world shadow matting, and its associated labeled occluder.
- **DESOBA** [185] is a synthesized dataset derived from real-world images, based on SOBA [108]. Shadows are removed to serve as the ground truth for shadow generation. It contains 840 training images with 2,999 shadow-object pairs, including the testing set of 160 images with 624 shadow-object pairs.
- **RdSOBA** [190] is a synthesized dataset created using the Unity game engine. It features 30 3D scenes and 800 objects, comprising 114,350 images with 28,000 shadow-object pairs.
- **DESOBAv2** [191] is a large dataset built by using the instance shadow detection method and inpainting method. It includes 21,575 images with 28,573 shadow-object associations.

5.2.2 Shadow Generation Datasets for Sketch

- **SmartShadow** [183] offers real and synthetic data. It comprises 1,670 pairs of line arts and shadows created by artists, 25,413 pairs synthesized by rendering engines, and 291,951 shadow pairs extracted from digital paintings found on the Internet.

5.3 Discussion

Different methods require different specific training data due to their unique model designs and applications. For example, SGRNet requires a foreground shadow mask and a target shadow image for image composition. In contrast, Mask-ShadowGAN only needs unpaired shadow and shadow-free images for shadow removal. ARShadowGAN uses binary maps of real shadows and their occluders for training, generating shadows for virtual objects in augmented reality. SmartShadow utilizes line drawings and shadow pairs provided by artists to train the deep network to generate shadows on line drawings. Due to space constraints, we recommend that readers explore the results of each application to understand the effectiveness and suitability of the methods.

However, current shadow generation methods focus on single objects in images, and *how to generate consistent shadows for multiple objects in videos* remains a challenge. Additionally, besides generating shadows for objects that lack shadows, *how to edit the shadows of various objects by adjusting the light directions* offers more practical applications.

6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In conclusion, this paper advances the research in shadow detection, removal, and generation in the era of deep learning by surveying over one hundred methodologies and standardizing experimental setups. We explore the relations between model size, speed, and performance, and evaluate robustness through cross-dataset study. Below, we further present open issues and future research directions, highlighting the impact of AIGC and large models to advance both academic research and practical applications in this field.

All-in-one model for shadow and object detection, removal, and generation is a promising research direction. Most existing methods specialize in just one specific task—detection, removal, or generation of shadows. However, all shadow-related tasks are inherently related and could theoretically benefit from shared

insights, considering the geometry between objects and their shadows. Developing a unified model could unveil underlying relationships and maximize the use of training data, thereby enhancing the model’s generalization capabilities.

The semantics and geometries of objects remain under-explored in shadow analysis. Modern large vision and vision-language models, equipped with extensive network parameters and vast training datasets, exhibit promising performance and notable zero-shot capabilities in analyzing semantic and geometric information in images and videos. For example, Segment Anything [97], [192] provides pixel-level segmentation labels; Depth Anything [193], [194] estimates depth for any image inputs; and ChatGPT-4o [195] predicts narratives for images and video frames. Leveraging these semantic and geometric insights for shadow perception may significantly enhance shadow analysis and editing, even aiding in the separation of overlapping shadows.

Shadow-object relationships assist in performing various image and video editing tasks. Instance shadow detection generates masks for both object and shadow instances, facilitating editing tasks such as inpainting, instance cloning, and shadow modification, as demonstrated in [108], [109], [110], [111]. For example, image outpainting [196] is accomplished by analyzing the observed objects and their shadows through instance shadow detection [110] to estimate the layout of the unobserved objects based on their cast shadows. Incorporating these applications into mobile phones for photo and video editing is both straightforward and beneficial. Given that modern mobile phones are equipped with multiple cameras and high dynamic range, exploring how to leverage these cameras for enhanced shadow-object editing presents a novel research direction.

Shadow is an effective means for differentiating AI-generated visual contents from real ones. Recent advancements in AI-generated contents (AIGC) have enabled the creation of diverse images and videos. However, these AI-generated contents often overlook the geometric aspects, leading to discrepancies in the shadow properties that disrupt the 3D perception. Instance shadow detection [110] was employed by [197] to analyze object-shadow relationships, revealing the synthetic nature of images when the light source alignment and object geometry are inconsistent. AI-generated videos (e.g., Sora³) also need to adhere to 3D geometric relations. Therefore, it is important and intriguing to explore future research directions, focusing on shadow consistency in AI-generated contents and assessing or locating potential inconsistencies. Besides, shadow is a natural and stealthy adversarial attack that can disrupt machine learning models [198].

REFERENCES

- [1] F. C. Crow, “Shadow algorithms for computer graphics,” *SIGGRAPH*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 242–248, 1977.
- [2] R. B. Irvin and D. M. McKeown, “Methods for exploiting the relationship between buildings and their shadows in aerial imagery,” *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1564–1575, 1989.
- [3] J. M. Scanlan, D. M. Chabries, and R. W. Christiansen, “A shadow detection and removal algorithm for 2-D images,” in *ICASSP*, 1990, pp. 2057–2060.
- [4] C. Jiang and M. O. Ward, “Shadow identification,” in *CVPR*, 1992, pp. 606–607.
- [5] P. L. Rosin and T. J. Ellis, “Image difference threshold strategies and shadow detection,” in *BMVC*, vol. 95, 1995, pp. 347–356.
- [6] G. Funka-Lea and R. Bajcsy, “Combining color and geometry for the active, visual recognition of shadows,” in *ICCV*, 1995, pp. 203–209.

3. <https://openai.com/index/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators>

- [7] E. Salvador and T. Ebrahimi, "Cast shadow recognition in color images," in *EUSIPCO*, 2002, pp. 1–4.
- [8] G. D. Finlayson, S. D. Hordley, and M. S. Drew, "Removing shadows from images," in *ECCV*, 2002, pp. 823–836.
- [9] A. Prati, I. Mikic, M. M. Trivedi, and R. Cucchiara, "Detecting moving shadows: algorithms and evaluation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 918–923, 2003.
- [10] E. Salvador, A. Cavallaro, and T. Ebrahimi, "Spatio-temporal shadow segmentation and tracking," in *Image Video Commun. Process.*, 2003, pp. 389–400.
- [11] S. Nadimi and B. Bhanu, "Physical models for moving shadow and object detection in video," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1079–1087, 2004.
- [12] E. Salvador, A. Cavallaro, and T. Ebrahimi, "Cast shadow segmentation using invariant color features," *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 238–259, 2004.
- [13] G. D. Finlayson, S. D. Hordley, C. Lu, and M. S. Drew, "On the removal of shadows from images," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 59–68, 2006.
- [14] T.-P. Wu, C.-K. Tang, M. S. Brown, and H.-Y. Shum, "Natural shadow matting," *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 26, no. 2, p. 8, 2007.
- [15] F. Liu and M. Gleicher, "Texture-consistent shadow removal," in *ECCV*, 2008, pp. 437–450.
- [16] G. D. Finlayson, M. S. Drew, and C. Lu, "Entropy minimization for shadow removal," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 35–57, 2009.
- [17] J.-F. Lalonde, A. A. Efros, and S. G. Narasimhan, "Detecting ground shadows in outdoor consumer photographs," in *ECCV*, 2010, pp. 322–335.
- [18] J. Zhu, K. G. G. Samuel, S. Z. Masood, and M. F. Tappen, "Learning to recognize shadows in monochromatic natural images," in *CVPR*, 2010, pp. 223–230.
- [19] R. Guo, Q. Dai, and D. Hoiem, "Single-image shadow detection and removal using paired regions," in *CVPR*, 2011, pp. 2033–2040.
- [20] X. Huang, G. Hua, J. Tumblin, and L. Williams, "What characterizes a shadow boundary under the sun and sky?" in *ICCV*, 2011, pp. 898–905.
- [21] R. Guo, Q. Dai, and D. Hoiem, "Paired regions for shadow detection and removal," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 2956–2967, 2013.
- [22] H. Gong and D. P. Cosker, "Interactive shadow removal and ground truth for variable scene categories," in *BMVC*, 2014, pp. 1–11.
- [23] T. F. Y. Vicente, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "Leave-one-out kernel optimization for shadow detection," in *ICCV*, 2015, pp. 3388–3396.
- [24] M. Gryka, M. Terry, and G. J. Brostow, "Learning to remove soft shadows," *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 34, no. 5, p. 153, 2015.
- [25] S. H. Khan, M. Bennamoun, F. Sohel, and R. Togneri, "Automatic feature learning for robust shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2014, pp. 1939–1946.
- [26] X. Hu, "Shadow detection and removal with deep learning," Ph.D. dissertation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong), 2020.
- [27] S. K. Alavipanah, M. Karimi Firozjaei, A. Sedighi, S. Fatholoulumi, S. Zare Naghadehi, S. Saleh, M. Naghdizadegan *et al.*, "The shadow effect on surface biophysical variables derived from remote sensing: a review," *Land*, vol. 11, no. 11, 2022.
- [28] A. Woo, P. Poulin, and A. Fournier, "A survey of shadow algorithms," *IEEE Comput. Graph. Appl.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 13–32, 1990.
- [29] A. Prati, R. Cucchiara, I. Mikic, and M. M. Trivedi, "Analysis and detection of shadows in video streams: a comparative evaluation," in *CVPR*, 2001, pp. II–517–II–576.
- [30] A. Prati, I. Mikic, R. Cucchiara, M. M. Trivedi *et al.*, "Comparative evaluation of moving shadow detection algorithms," in *CVPR workshop on Empirical Evaluation Methods in Computer Vision*, 2001, pp. 1–8.
- [31] N. Al-Najdawi, H. E. Bez, J. Singhai, and E. A. Edirisinghe, "A survey of cast shadow detection algorithms," *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 752–764, 2012.
- [32] A. Sanin, C. Sanderson, and B. C. Lovell, "Shadow detection: A survey and comparative evaluation of recent methods," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1684–1695, 2012.
- [33] A. Shahtahmassebi, N. Yang, K. Wang, N. Moore, and Z. Shen, "Review of shadow detection and de-shadowing methods in remote sensing," *Chinese Geographical Science*, vol. 23, pp. 403–420, 2013.
- [34] R. K. Sasi and V. Govindan, "Shadow detection and removal from real images: state of art," in *Int. Symp. Women Comput. Inform.*, 2015, pp. 309–317.
- [35] R. Mahajan and A. Bajpayee, "A survey on shadow detection and removal based on single light source," in *ISCO*, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [36] A. Tiwari, P. K. Singh, and S. Amin, "A survey on shadow detection and removal in images and video sequences," in *Int. Conf. Cloud Syst. Big Data Eng. (Confluence)*, 2016, pp. 518–523.
- [37] Y. Mostafa, "A review on various shadow detection and compensation techniques in remote sensing images," *Can. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 545–562, 2017.
- [38] S. Murali, V. Govindan, and S. Kalady, "A survey on shadow detection techniques in a single image," *Information Technol. Control*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 75–92, 2018.
- [39] X. Dong, J. Cao, and W. Zhao, "A review of research on remote sensing images shadow detection and application to building extraction," *Eur. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2024.
- [40] B. Lei, W. Wan, Q. Bu, and S. Sholtanyuk, "Shadow detection and segmentation on satellite images: a survey," in *Pattern Recogn. Inf. Process.*, 2023, pp. 245–252.
- [41] L. Guo, C. Wang, Y. Wang, S. Huang, W. Yang, A. C. Kot, and B. Wen, "Single-image shadow removal using deep learning: A comprehensive survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08865*, 2024.
- [42] S. H. Khan, M. Bennamoun, F. Sohel, and R. Togneri, "Automatic shadow detection and removal from a single image," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 431–446, 2016.
- [43] L. Shen, T. Wee Chua, and K. Leman, "Shadow optimization from structured deep edge detection," in *CVPR*, 2015, pp. 2067–2074.
- [44] T. F. Y. Vicente, L. Hou, C.-P. Yu, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "Large-scale training of shadow detectors with noisily-annotated shadow examples," in *ECCV*, 2016, pp. 816–832.
- [45] L. Hou, T. F. Y. Vicente, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "Large scale shadow annotation and detection using lazy annotation and stacked CNNs," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 1337–1351, 2021.
- [46] V. Nguyen, T. F. Y. Vicente, M. Zhao, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "Shadow detection with conditional generative adversarial networks," in *ICCV*, 2017, pp. 4510–4518.
- [47] S. Hosseinzadeh, M. Shakeri, and H. Zhang, "Fast shadow detection from a single image using a patched convolutional neural network," in *IROS*, 2018, pp. 3124–3129.
- [48] J. Wang, X. Li, and J. Yang, "Stacked conditional generative adversarial networks for jointly learning shadow detection and shadow removal," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 1788–1797.
- [49] X. Hu, L. Zhu, C.-W. Fu, J. Qin, and P.-A. Heng, "Direction-aware spatial context features for shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 7454–7462.
- [50] X. Hu, C.-W. Fu, L. Zhu, J. Qin, and P.-A. Heng, "Direction-aware spatial context features for shadow detection and removal," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 2795–2808, 2020.
- [51] Y. Wang, X. Zhao, Y. Li, X. Hu, and K. Huang, "Densely cascaded shadow detection network via deeply supervised parallel fusion," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 1007–1013.
- [52] S. Mohajerani and P. Saeedi, "CPNet: A context preserver convolutional neural network for detecting shadows in single RGB images," in *MMSP (Workshop)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [53] H. Le, T. F. Y. Vicente, V. Nguyen, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "A+D Net: Training a shadow detector with adversarial shadow attenuation," in *ECCV*, 2018, pp. 662–678.
- [54] L. Zhu, Z. Deng, X. Hu, C.-W. Fu, X. Xu, J. Qin, and P.-A. Heng, "Bidirectional feature pyramid network with recurrent attention residual modules for shadow detection," in *ECCV*, 2018, pp. 121–136.
- [55] Q. Zheng, X. Qiao, Y. Cao, and R. W. Lau, "Distraction-aware shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 5167–5176.
- [56] B. Ding, C. Long, L. Zhang, and C. Xiao, "ARGAN: Attentive recurrent generative adversarial network for shadow detection and removal," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 10213–10222.
- [57] S. Mohajerani and P. Saeedi, "Shadow detection in single RGB images using a context preserver convolutional neural network trained by multiple adversarial examples," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 4117–4129, 2019.
- [58] Z. Chen, L. Zhu, L. Wan, S. Wang, W. Feng, and P.-A. Heng, "A multi-task mean teacher for semi-supervised shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 5611–5620.
- [59] S. Luo, H. Li, and H. Shen, "Deeply supervised convolutional neural network for shadow detection based on a novel aerial shadow imagery dataset," *J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, vol. 167, pp. 443–457, 2020.
- [60] L. Zhu, K. Xu, Z. Ke, and R. W. Lau, "Mitigating intensity bias in shadow detection via feature decomposition and reweighting," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 4702–4711.

- [61] X. Hu, T. Wang, C.-W. Fu, Y. Jiang, Q. Wang, and P.-A. Heng, "Revisiting shadow detection: A new benchmark dataset for complex world," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 30, pp. 1925–1934, 2021.
- [62] X. Fang, X. He, L. Wang, and J. Shen, "Robust shadow detection by exploring effective shadow contexts," in *ACMMM*, 2021, pp. 2927–2935.
- [63] J. Liao, Y. Liu, G. Xing, H. Wei, J. Chen, and S. Xu, "Shadow detection via predicting the confidence maps of shadow detection methods," in *ACMMM*, 2021, pp. 704–712.
- [64] Y. Zhu, X. Fu, C. Cao, X. Wang, Q. Sun, and Z.-J. Zha, "Single image shadow detection via complementary mechanism," in *ACMMM*, 2022, pp. 6717–6726.
- [65] L. Jie and H. Zhang, "A fast and efficient network for single image shadow detection," in *ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 2634–2638.
- [66] H. Yang, T. Wang, X. Hu, and C.-W. Fu, "SILT: Shadow-aware iterative label tuning for learning to detect shadows from noisy labels," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 12 687–12 698.
- [67] J. Sun, K. Xu, Y. Pang, L. Zhang, H. Lu, G. Hancke, and R. W. Lau, "Adaptive illumination mapping for shadow detection in raw images," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 12 709–12 718.
- [68] J. M. J. Valanarasu and V. M. Patel, "Fine-context shadow detection using shadow removal," in *WACV*, 2023, pp. 1705–1714.
- [69] M. K. Yücel, V. Dimaridou, B. Manganelli, M. Ozay, A. Drosou, and A. Saa-Garriga, "LRA&LDRA: Rethinking residual predictions for efficient shadow detection and removal," in *WACV*, 2023, pp. 4925–4935.
- [70] R. Cong, Y. Guan, J. Chen, W. Zhang, Y. Zhao, and S. Kwong, "SDDNet: Style-guided dual-layer disentanglement network for shadow detection," in *ACMMM*, 2023, pp. 1202–1211.
- [71] W. Wu, W. Yang, W. Ma, and X.-D. Chen, "How many annotations do we need for generalizing new-coming shadow images?" *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2023.
- [72] T. Chen, L. Zhu, C. Deng, R. Cao, Y. Wang, S. Zhang, Z. Li, L. Sun, Y. Zang, and P. Mao, "SAM-adaptor: Adapting segment anything in underperformed scenes," in *ICCV Workshops*, 2023, pp. 3367–3375.
- [73] X.-D. Chen, W. Wu, W. Yang, H. Qin, X. Wu, and X. Mao, "Make segment anything model perfect on shadow detection," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, 2023.
- [74] L. Jie and H. Zhang, "AdapterShadow: Adapting segment anything model for shadow detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08891*, 2023.
- [75] J. Long, E. Shelhamer, and T. Darrell, "Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation," in *CVPR*, 2015, pp. 3431–3440.
- [76] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [77] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," in *MICCAI*, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [78] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, "MobileNetV2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 4510–4520.
- [79] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," in *NeurIPS*, 2014.
- [80] L. A. Gatys, A. S. Ecker, and M. Bethge, "Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks," in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 2414–2423.
- [81] A. Tarvainen and H. Valpola, "Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results," in *NeurIPS*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [82] E. Xie, W. Wang, Z. Yu, A. Anandkumar, J. M. Alvarez, and P. Luo, "SegFormer: Simple and efficient design for semantic segmentation with transformers," in *NeurIPS*, 2021, pp. 12 077–12 090.
- [83] B. Zhou, Q. Cui, X.-S. Wei, and Z.-M. Chen, "BBN: Bilateral-branch network with cumulative learning for long-tailed visual recognition," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 9719–9728.
- [84] S. Xie, R. Girshick, P. Dollár, Z. Tu, and K. He, "Aggregated residual transformations for deep neural networks," in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 1492–1500.
- [85] M. Tan and Q. Le, "EfficientNet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks," in *ICML*, 2019, pp. 6105–6114.
- [86] W. Wang, E. Xie, X. Li, D.-P. Fan, K. Song, D. Liang, T. Lu, P. Luo, and L. Shao, "PVT v2: Improved baselines with pyramid vision transformer," *Comput. Vis. Media*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 415–424, 2022.
- [87] Z. Chen, L. Wan, L. Zhu, J. Shen, H. Fu, W. Liu, and J. Qin, "Triple-cooperative video shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 2715–2724.
- [88] S. Hu, H. Le, and D. Samaras, "Temporal feature warping for video shadow detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14287*, 2021.
- [89] X. Lu, Y. Cao, S. Liu, C. Long, Z. Chen, X. Zhou, Y. Yang, and C. Xiao, "Video shadow detection via spatio-temporal interpolation consistency training," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 3116–3125.
- [90] X. Ding, J. Yang, X. Hu, and X. Li, "Learning shadow correspondence for video shadow detection," in *ECCV*, 2022, pp. 705–722.
- [91] J. Lin and L. Wang, "Spatial-temporal fusion network for fast video shadow detection," in *ACM SIGGRAPH VRCAI*, 2022, pp. 1–5.
- [92] L. Liu, J. Prost, L. Zhu, N. Papadakis, P. Liò, C.-B. Schönlieb, and A. I. Aviles-Rivero, "Scotch and soda: A transformer video shadow detection framework," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 10 449–10 458.
- [93] Y. Wang, W. Zhou, Y. Mao, and H. Li, "Detect any shadow: Segment anything for video shadow detection," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2023.
- [94] H. Wang, W. Wang, H. Zhou, H. Xu, S. Wu, and L. Zhu, "Language-driven interactive shadow detection," in *ACMMM*, 2024.
- [95] H. Zhou, H. Wang, T. Ye, Z. Xing, J. Ma, P. Li, Q. Wang, and L. Zhu, "Timeline and boundary guided diffusion network for video shadow detection," in *ACMMM*, 2024.
- [96] X. Duan, Y. Cao, L. Zhu, G. Fu, X. Wang, R. Zhang, and P. Li, "Two-stage video shadow detection via temporal-spatial adaption," in *ECCV*, 2024.
- [97] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo *et al.*, "Segment anything," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023.
- [98] L. Jie and H. Zhang, "When SAM meets shadow detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11513*, 2023.
- [99] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," in *ICLR*, 2020.
- [100] S.-H. Gao, M.-M. Cheng, K. Zhao, X.-Y. Zhang, M.-H. Yang, and P. Torr, "Res2Net: A new multi-scale backbone architecture," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 652–662, 2019.
- [101] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawal, "Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 3836–3847.
- [102] T. F. Y. Vicente, M. Hoai, and D. Samaras, "Noisy label recovery for shadow detection in unfamiliar domains," in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 3783–3792.
- [103] N. Inoue and T. Yamasaki, "Learning from synthetic shadows for shadow detection and removal," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 4187–4197, 2021.
- [104] X. Hu, Y. Jiang, C.-W. Fu, and P.-A. Heng, "Mask-ShadowGAN: Learning to remove shadows from unpaired data," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 2472–2481.
- [105] R. Margolin, L. Zelnik-Manor, and A. Tal, "How to evaluate foreground maps?" in *CVPR*, 2014, pp. 248–255.
- [106] L. Liu, J. Zhang, R. He, Y. Liu, Y. Wang, Y. Tai, D. Luo, C. Wang, J. Li, and F. Huang, "Learning by analogy: Reliable supervision from transformations for unsupervised optical flow estimation," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 6489–6498.
- [107] Z. Teed and J. Deng, "RAFT: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow," in *ECCV*, 2020, pp. 402–419.
- [108] T. Wang*, X. Hu*, Q. Wang, P.-A. Heng, and C.-W. Fu, "Instance shadow detection," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 1880–1889, *Joint first authors.
- [109] T. Wang*, X. Hu*, C.-W. Fu, and P.-A. Heng, "Single-stage instance shadow detection with bidirectional relation learning," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 1–11, *Joint first authors, oral presentation.
- [110] T. Wang, X. Hu, P.-A. Heng, and C.-W. Fu, "Instance shadow detection with a single-stage detector," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 3259–3273, 2023.
- [111] Z. Xing, T. Wang, X. Hu, H. Wu, C.-W. Fu, and P.-A. Heng, "Video instance shadow detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12827*, 2022.
- [112] L. Qu, J. Tian, S. He, Y. Tang, and R. W. Lau, "DeshadowNet: A multi-context embedding deep network for shadow removal," in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 4067–4075.
- [113] O. Sidorov, "Conditional GANs for multi-illuminant color constancy: Revolution or yet another approach?" in *CVPR Workshops*, 2019.
- [114] H. Le and D. Samaras, "Shadow removal via shadow image decomposition," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 8578–8587.
- [115] L. Zhang, C. Long, X. Zhang, and C. Xiao, "RIS-GAN: Explore residual and illumination with generative adversarial networks for shadow removal," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 12 829–12 836.
- [116] X. Cun, C.-M. Pun, and C. Shi, "Towards ghost-free shadow removal via dual hierarchical aggregation network and shadow matting GAN," in *AAAI*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 10 680–10 687.
- [117] H. Le and D. Samaras, "From shadow segmentation to shadow removal," in *ECCV*, 2020, pp. 264–281.

- [118] —, “Physics-based shadow image decomposition for shadow removal,” *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 9088–9101, 2021.
- [119] L. Fu, C. Zhou, Q. Guo, F. J. Xu, H. Yu, W. Feng, Y. Liu, and S. Wang, “Auto-exposure fusion for single-image shadow removal,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 10 571–10 580.
- [120] Z. Liu, H. Yin, X. Wu, Z. Wu, Y. Mi, and S. Wang, “From shadow generation to shadow removal,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 4927–4936.
- [121] F.-A. Vasluianu, A. Romero, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte, “Shadow removal with paired and unpaired learning,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2021, pp. 826–835.
- [122] Z. Chen, C. Long, L. Zhang, and C. Xiao, “CANet: A context-aware network for shadow removal,” in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 4743–4752.
- [123] Y. Jin, A. Sharma, and R. T. Tan, “DC-ShadowNet: Single-image hard and soft shadow removal using unsupervised domain-classifier guided network,” in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 5027–5036.
- [124] Z. Liu, H. Yin, Y. Mi, M. Pu, and S. Wang, “Shadow removal by a lightness-guided network with training on unpaired data,” *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 30, pp. 1853–1865, 2021.
- [125] Y. Zhu, Z. Xiao, Y. Fang, X. Fu, Z. Xiong, and Z.-J. Zha, “Efficient model-driven network for shadow removal,” in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2022, pp. 3635–3643.
- [126] J. Wan, H. Yin, Z. Wu, X. Wu, Z. Liu, and S. Wang, “Crformer: A cross-region transformer for shadow removal,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01600*, 2022.
- [127] Y. Zhu, J. Huang, X. Fu, F. Zhao, Q. Sun, and Z.-J. Zha, “Bijective mapping network for shadow removal,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 5627–5636.
- [128] J. Gao, Q. Zheng, and Y. Guo, “Towards real-world shadow removal with a shadow simulation method and a two-stage framework,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2022, pp. 599–608.
- [129] J. Wan, H. Yin, Z. Wu, X. Wu, Y. Liu, and S. Wang, “Style-guided shadow removal,” in *ECCV*, 2022, pp. 361–378.
- [130] Q. Yu, N. Zheng, J. Huang, and F. Zhao, “CNSNet: A cleanliness-navigated-shadow network for shadow removal,” in *ECCV Workshops*, 2022, pp. 221–238.
- [131] Y. Jin, W. Yang, W. Ye, Y. Yuan, and R. T. Tan, “Shadowdiffusion: Diffusion-based shadow removal using classifier-driven attention and structure preservation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08089*, vol. 2, 2022.
- [132] L. Guo, C. Wang, W. Yang, S. Huang, Y. Wang, H. Pfister, and B. Wen, “Shadowdiffusion: When degradation prior meets diffusion model for shadow removal,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 14 049–14 058.
- [133] Y. Liu, Q. Guo, L. Fu, Z. Ke, K. Xu, W. Feng, I. W. Tsang, and R. W. Lau, “Structure-informed shadow removal networks,” *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 2023.
- [134] H. Jiang, Q. Zhang, Y. Nie, L. Zhu, and W.-S. Zheng, “Learning to remove shadows from a single image,” *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 131, no. 9, pp. 2471–2488, 2023.
- [135] L. Guo, S. Huang, D. Liu, H. Cheng, and B. Wen, “ShadowFormer: global context helps shadow removal,” in *AAAI*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2023, pp. 710–718.
- [136] X. Zhang, Y. Zhao, C. Gu, C. Lu, and S. Zhu, “SpA-Former: an effective and lightweight transformer for image shadow removal,” in *IJCNN*, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [137] F.-A. Vasluianu, T. Seizinger, and R. Timofte, “WSRD: A novel benchmark for high resolution image shadow removal,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2023, pp. 1826–1835.
- [138] H.-E. Chang, C.-H. Hsieh, H.-H. Yang, I.-H. Chen, Y.-C. Chen, Y.-C. Chiang, Z.-K. Huang, W.-T. Chen, and S.-Y. Kuo, “TSRFormer: Transformer based two-stage refinement for single image shadow removal,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2023, pp. 1436–1446.
- [139] S. Cui, J. Huang, S. Tian, M. Fan, J. Zhang, L. Zhu, X. Wei, and X. Wei, “Pyramid ensemble structure for high resolution image shadow removal,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2023, pp. 1311–1319.
- [140] L. Guo, C. Wang, W. Yang, Y. Wang, and B. Wen, “Boundary-aware divide and conquer: A diffusion-based solution for unsupervised shadow removal,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 13 045–13 054.
- [141] X. Li, Q. Guo, R. Abdelfattah, D. Lin, W. Feng, I. Tsang, and S. Wang, “Leveraging inpainting for single-image shadow removal,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 13 055–13 064.
- [142] M. Sen, S. P. Chermala, N. N. Nagori, V. Peddigari, P. Mathur, B. Prasad, and M. Jeong, “SHARDS: Efficient shadow removal using dual stage network for high-resolution images,” in *WACV*, 2023, pp. 1809–1817.
- [143] J. Liu, Q. Wang, H. Fan, J. Tian, and Y. Tang, “A shadow imaging bilinear model and three-branch residual network for shadow removal,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 2023, early access.
- [144] Y. Wang, W. Zhou, H. Feng, L. Li, and H. Li, “Progressive recurrent network for shadow removal,” *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, vol. 238, p. 103861, 2024.
- [145] Y. Jin, W. Yang, W. Ye, Y. Yuan, and R. T. Tan, “DeS3: Adaptive attention-driven self and soft shadow removal using ViT similarity,” in *AAAI*, 2024.
- [146] Y. Liu, Z. Ke, K. Xu, F. Liu, Z. Wang, and R. W. Lau, “Recasting regional lighting for shadow removal,” in *AAAI*, 2024.
- [147] K. Mei, L. Figueroa, Z. Lin, Z. Ding, S. Cohen, and V. M. Patel, “Latent feature-guided diffusion models for shadow removal,” in *WACV*, 2024, pp. 4313–4322.
- [148] Z. Li, G. Xie, G. Jiang, and Z. Lu, “ShadowMaskFormer: Mask augmented patch embeddings for shadow removal,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18433*, 2024.
- [149] W. Dong, H. Zhou, Y. Tian, J. Sun, X. Liu, G. Zhai, and J. Chen, “ShadowRefiner: Towards mask-free shadow removal via fast Fourier transformer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02559*, 2024.
- [150] J. Xiao, X. Fu, Y. Zhu, D. Li, J. Huang, K. Zhu, and Z.-J. Zha, “HomoFormer: Homogenized transformer for image shadow removal,” in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 25 617–25 626.
- [151] Z. Zeng, C. Zhao, W. Cai, and C. Dong, “Semantic-guided adversarial diffusion model for self-supervised shadow removal,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01104*, 2024.
- [152] J. Luo, R. Li, C. Jiang, M. Han, X. Zhang, T. Jiang, H. Fan, and S. Liu, “Diff-Shadow: Global-guided diffusion model for shadow removal,” *arXiv:2407.16214*, 2024.
- [153] X. Chu, L. Chen, and W. Yu, “NAFSSR: Stereo image super-resolution using NAFNet,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2022, pp. 1239–1248.
- [154] M. Wortsman, G. Ilharco, S. Y. Gadre, R. Roelofs, R. Gontijo-Lopes, A. S. Morcos, H. Namkoong, A. Farhadi, Y. Carmon, S. Kornblith *et al.*, “Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time,” in *ICML*, 2022, pp. 23 965–23 998.
- [155] K. Cho, B. van Merriënboer, C. Gulcehre, D. Bahdanau, F. Bougares, H. Schwenk, and Y. Bengio, “Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder–decoder for statistical machine translation,” in *EMNLP*, 2014, pp. 1724–1734.
- [156] X. Mao, Y. Liu, W. Shen, Q. Li, and Y. Wang, “Deep residual Fourier transformation for single image deblurring,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.11745*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 5, 2021.
- [157] X. Hu, M. Shi, W. Wang, S. Wu, L. Xing, W. Wang, X. Zhu, L. Lu, J. Zhou, X. Wang *et al.*, “Demystify transformers & convolutions in modern image deep networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05781*, 2022.
- [158] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, “Denosing diffusion implicit models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502*, 2020.
- [159] Y.-H. Lin, W.-C. Chen, and Y.-Y. Chuang, “BEDSR-Net: A deep shadow removal network from a single document image,” in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 12 905–12 914.
- [160] L. Zhang, Y. He, Q. Zhang, Z. Liu, X. Zhang, and C. Xiao, “Document image shadow removal guided by color-aware background,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 1818–1827.
- [161] Z. Li, X. Chen, C.-M. Pun, and X. Cun, “High-resolution document shadow removal via a large-scale real-world dataset and a frequency-aware shadow erasing net,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 12 415–12 424.
- [162] X. C. Zhang, J. T. Barron, Y. Tsai, R. Pandey, X. Zhang, R. Ng, and D. E. Jacobs, “Portrait shadow manipulation,” *ACM Trans. Graph. (SIGGRAPH)*, vol. 39, no. 4, p. 78, 2020.
- [163] Y. He, Y. Xing, T. Zhang, and Q. Chen, “Unsupervised portrait shadow removal via generative priors,” in *ACMMM*, 2021, pp. 236–244.
- [164] Y. Liu, X. Huang, L. Ren, and X. Liu, “Blind removal of facial foreign shadows,” in *BMVC*, 2022.
- [165] J. Lyu, Z. Wang, and F. Xu, “Portrait eyeglasses and shadow removal by leveraging 3d synthetic data,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 3429–3439.
- [166] L. Zhang, B. Chen, Z. Liu, and C. Xiao, “Facial image shadow removal via graph-based feature fusion,” *Comp. Graph. Forum*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- [167] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *ICML*, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [168] Z. Wang, X. Cun, J. Bao, W. Zhou, J. Liu, and H. Li, “Uformer: A general U-shaped transformer for image restoration,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 17 683–17 693.
- [169] A. Hou, Z. Zhang, M. Sarkis, N. Bi, Y. Tong, and X. Liu, “Towards high fidelity face relighting with realistic shadows,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 14 719–14 728.

- [170] L. Fu, Q. Guo, F. Juefei-Xu, H. Yu, W. Feng, Y. Liu, and S. Wang, "Benchmarking shadow removal for facial landmark detection and beyond," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.13790*, 2021.
- [171] D. Fourure, R. Emonet, E. Fromont, D. Muselet, A. Tremeau, and C. Wolf, "Residual conv-deconv grid network for semantic segmentation," in *BMVC*, 2017.
- [172] S. Niklaus and F. Liu, "Context-aware synthesis for video frame interpolation," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 1701–1710.
- [173] Z. Chen, L. Wan, Y. Xiao, L. Zhu, and H. Fu, "Learning physical-spatio-temporal features for video shadow removal," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 5830–5842, 2024.
- [174] F.-A. Vasluianu, T. Seizinger, R. Timofte, and et al., "NTIRE 2023 image shadow removal challenge report," in *CVPR Workshops*, 2023, pp. 1788–1807.
- [175] P. Debevec, T. Hawkins, C. Tchou, H.-P. Duiker, W. Sarokin, and M. Sagar, "Acquiring the reflectance field of a human face," in *SIGGRAPH*, 2000, pp. 145–156.
- [176] R. Zhang, P. Isola, A. A. Efros, E. Shechtman, and O. Wang, "The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 586–595.
- [177] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," in *ICLR*, 2015.
- [178] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli, "Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 600–612, 2004.
- [179] S. Zhang, R. Liang, and M. Wang, "ShadowGAN: Shadow synthesis for virtual objects with conditional adversarial networks," *Comput. Vis. Media*, vol. 5, pp. 105–115, 2019.
- [180] D. Liu, C. Long, H. Zhang, H. Yu, X. Dong, and C. Xiao, "ARShadowGAN: Shadow generative adversarial network for augmented reality in single light scenes," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8139–8148.
- [181] Q. Zheng, Z. Li, and A. Bargteil, "Learning to shadow hand-drawn sketches," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 7436–7445.
- [182] Y. Sheng, J. Zhang, and B. Benes, "SSN: Soft shadow network for image compositing," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 4380–4390.
- [183] L. Zhang, J. Jiang, Y. Ji, and C. Liu, "SmartShadow: Artistic shadow drawing tool for line drawings," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 5391–5400.
- [184] Y. Sheng, Y. Liu, J. Zhang, W. Yin, A. C. Ozireli, H. Zhang, Z. Lin, E. Shechtman, and B. Benes, "Controllable shadow generation using pixel height maps," in *ECCV*, 2022, pp. 240–256.
- [185] Y. Hong, L. Niu, and J. Zhang, "Shadow generation for composite image in real-world scenes," in *AAAI*, 2022, pp. 914–922.
- [186] T. Liu, Y. Li, and Y. Ding, "Shadow generation for composite image with multi-level feature fusion," in *EITCE*, 2022, pp. 1396–1400.
- [187] Y. Sheng, J. Zhang, J. Philip, Y. Hold-Geoffroy, X. Sun, H. Zhang, L. Ling, and B. Benes, "PixHt-Lab: Pixel height based light effect generation for image compositing," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 16 643–16 653.
- [188] Q. Meng, S. Zhang, Z. Li, C. Wang, W. Zhang, and Q. Huang, "Automatic shadow generation via exposure fusion," *IEEE Trans. Multimedia*, pp. 9044–9056, 2023.
- [189] L. Valena, J. Zhang, M. Gharbi, Y. Hold-Geoffroy, and J.-F. Lalonde, "Shadow harmonization for realistic compositing," in *SIGGRAPH*, 2023, pp. 1–12.
- [190] X. Tao, J. Cao, Y. Hong, and L. Niu, "Shadow generation with decomposed mask prediction and attentive shadow filling," in *AAAI*, 2024, pp. 5198–5206.
- [191] Q. Liu, J. You, J. Wang, X. Tao, B. Zhang, and L. Niu, "Shadow generation for composite image using diffusion model," in *CVPR*, 2024.
- [192] N. Ravi, V. Gabeur, Y.-T. Hu, R. Hu, C. Ryali, T. Ma, H. Khedr, R. Radle, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson *et al.*, "SAM 2: Segment anything in images and videos," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714*, 2024.
- [193] L. Yang, B. Kang, Z. Huang, X. Xu, J. Feng, and H. Zhao, "Depth anything: Unleashing the power of large-scale unlabeled data," in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 10 371–10 381.
- [194] L. Yang, B. Kang, Z. Huang, Z. Zhao, X. Xu, J. Feng, and H. Zhao, "Depth anything v2," *arXiv:2406.09414*, 2024.
- [195] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, "GPT-4 technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [196] H. Yu, R. Li, S. Xie, and J. Qiu, "Shadow-enlightened image outpainting," in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 7850–7860.
- [197] A. Sarkar, H. Mai, A. Mahapatra, S. Lazebnik, and A. Bhattad, "Shadows don't lie and lines can't bend! generative models don't know projective geometry... for now," in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 28 140–28 149.
- [198] Y. Zhong, X. Liu, D. Zhai, J. Jiang, and X. Ji, "Shadows can be dangerous: Stealthy and effective physical-world adversarial attack by natural phenomenon," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 15 345–15 354.