# Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather: Datasets and Baselines

Sai Yang, Bin Hu, Bojun Zhou, Fan Liu, Member, IEEE, Xiaoxin Wu, Xinsong Zhang Member, IEEE, Juping Gu, Senior Member, IEEE, Jun Zhou, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract—Power Line Autonomous Inspection (PLAI) plays a crucial role in the construction of smart grids due to its great advantages of low cost, high efficiency, and safe operation. PLAI is completed by accurately detecting the electrical components and defects in the aerial images captured by Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). However, the visible quality of aerial images is inevitably degraded by adverse weather like haze, rain, or snow, which are found to drastically decrease the detection accuracy in our research. To circumvent this problem, we propose a new task of Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW), which aims to recover clean and highquality images from degraded images with bad weather thus improving detection performance for PLAI. In this context, we are the first to release numerous corresponding datasets, namely, HazeCPLID, HazeTTPLA, HazeInsPLAD for power line aerial image dehazing, RainCPLID, RainTTPLA, RainInsPLAD for power line aerial image deraining, SnowCPLID, SnowInsPLAD for power line aerial image desnowing, which are synthesized upon the public power line aerial image datasets of CPLID, TTPLA, InsPLAD following the mathematical models. Meanwhile, we select numerous state-of-the-art methods from image restoration community as the baseline methods for PLAIR-AW. At last, we conduct large-scale empirical experiments to evaluate the performance of baseline methods on the proposed datasets. The proposed datasets and trained models are available at https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW.

*Index Terms*—Power line autonomous inspection, power line aerial image restoration, power line aerial image dehazing, power line aerial image desnowing.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**U**NDOUBTEDLY, smart grid has become the common development trend for future power systems around the world [1], [2]. The overhead power transmission lines are critical infrastructures of the power system, and their working

This work was partially supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (62372155, 62273188, U2066203, 61973178, 52377117), Nantong Science and Technology Program Project (MS2023060)

Corresponding author: Fan Liu and Juping Gu

Sai Yang, Xiaoxin Wu, Xinsong Zhang are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Nantong University, Nantong, 226019, China (e-mail: yangsai@ntu.edu.cn, wu.xx@ntu.edu.cn, zhang.xs@ntu.edu.cn)

Bin Hu is with the School of Artificial Intelligence and Computer Science, Nantong University, Nantong, 226019, China (e-mail: hubin@ntu.edu.cn)

Bojun Zhou and Juping Gu are the School of Information Science and Technology, Nantong University, Nantong, 226019, China (e-mail: zhoubj@ntu.edu.cn, gu.jp@ntu.edu.cn)

Fan Liu is with the College of Computer and Software Engineering, Hohai University, Nanjing 210098, China (e-mail: fanliu@hhu.edu.cn).

Juping Gu is with the School of Electronic and Information Engineering, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, Suzhou, 215009, China, (email: gu.jp@ntu.edu.cn).

Jun Zhou is with the School of Information and Communication Technology, Griffith University, Nathan, QLD 4111, Australia (email:jun.zhou@griffith.edu.au).



Fig. 1. (a) Average precision (AP) of the advanced real-time instance segmentation model on a popular dataset of TTPLA under Normal, Hazy, Rainy, and Snowy conditions, respectively. There is a substantial decline in adverse weather compared with the normal situation. (b) The visual comparison between normal and hazy conditions, suggests that missed and false detection exists in hazy cases. (c) The general solution framework is based on deep learning for Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW). The power line aerial images under adverse weather are input into the deep neural network, which outputs the restored images. Then, the objective function is established between the ground-truths and the restored images. The deep neural network is deployed to do the PLAIR-AW test.

status directly affects the stability and reliability of the entire power system. Power line inspection can timely identify and eliminate potential hazards thus avoiding unplanned outages. The traditional way of power line inspection is the manual inspection, which suffers from the disadvantages of low efficiency and high risk. Instead, Power Line Autonomous Inspection (PLAI) with Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) has gradually become the mainstream inspection way, thanks to the low cost, high efficiency, and safe operation. PLAI is of great importance to guarantee the safe, reliable, and efficient operation of the smart grid, which has received increasing attention from the community [3], [4].

With the developments of UAVs and Artificial Intelligence (AI), PLAI is generally implemented by detecting key electrical components and defects with deep learning techniques in aerial images captured by UAVs [5]-[9]. Since adverse weather such as haze, rain, and snow are common phenomena, the aerial images captured under such conditions are inevitably subject to severe visibility degradation of color fidelity, blurring, low contrast, and obscured objects, thereby seriously reducing the detection accuracy. To support the above argument, we conducted a pilot study on the popular power line inspection dataset of TTPLA [10] with the state-of-theart real-time instance segmentation model of YOLACT [11]. This experiment was implemented with normal images, hazy images, rain images, and snowy images, respectively. We select the Average Precision (AP) as the performance metric and report the results in Fig. 1 (a), where AP in hazy, rainy, and snowy conditions are lower than the normal case. The visual comparison between the normal condition and the hazy condition is illustrated in Fig. 1 (b), revealing that there appeared missed and false detection in the hazy case.

To improve the detection performance for PLAI, we propose a new task of Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW), which attempts to recover clean and high-quality images from degraded images captured by UAVs in adverse weather conditions. PAIR-AW is a highly challenging task because of its ill-posed nature. Considering the powerful nonlinear representation capabilities of deep neural networks, we formulate the general solution framework based on deep learning for PAIR-AW in Fig. 1 (c). It follows that the three key factors are the data, model architecture, and objective function. Wherein, the data is the prerequisite of the solution, while model architecture and objective function are determined by the specific method. Therefore, we provide the corresponding datasets and baselines for the in-depth research for PAIR-AW. Specifically, according to weather type, PAIR-AW is further subdivided into three sub-tasks, i.e. power line aerial image dehazing, power line aerial image draining, and power line aerial image desnowing. We establish datasets for each separate sub-task based on the public power line aerial image datasets of CPLID [12], TTPLA [10], InsPLAD [13]. Following the Atmospheric Scattering Model (ASM) [14], [15], we construct synthetic datasets of HazeC-PLID, HazeTTPLA, and HazeInsPLAD for the dehazing task. Following the Comprehensive Rain Model (CRM) [16], we construct synthetic datasets of RainCPLID, RainTTPLA, and RainInsPLAD for deraining tasks. Following the mathematical model proposed by Liu et al. [17], we construct synthetic datasets of SnowCPLID, and SnowTTPLA for the desnowing task. Otherwise, we select numerous state-of-the-art methods in the image restoration community as the baseline methods for PLAIR-AW. At last, we conduct large-scale empirical experiments to evaluate the performance of baseline methods on the proposed datasets.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

• This is the first to propose the new task of Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW), which attempts to recover clean and highquality images from degraded images captured by UAVs in adverse weather conditions. This research is of great importance to meet the realistic demand for power line autonomous inspection.

- We are the first to generate numerous power line aerial image datasets under multiple adverse weathers, which can provide strong support for the research of PLAIR-AW. Meanwhile, we also provide numerous excellent baseline methods for the new PLAIR-AW task.
- We conduct large-scale empirical experiments to evaluate the performance of baseline methods on the proposed datasets in both single-one and all-in-one settings.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section II, we mainly formulate the generation process of datasets for PLAIR-AW task. In Section III, we detail the baseline methods for PLAIR-AW task. In Section IV, we describe the extensive experimental comparison results among the baseline methods. Finally, we present a conclusion with some future research directions in Section V.

# II. PROBLEM SETTING AND DATASETS

As mentioned in the Introduction, sufficient paired degraded aerial images and clean images are prerequisites for deeplearning-based methods. However, it is impossible to capture the same scene by UAVs under normal and adverse weather conditions at the same time. Alternatively, we synthesize the hazy, rainy, and snowy images upon clean ones with simulated components in mathematical models to possibly approach the real adverse weather environment. The details are as follows:

# A. Power Line Aerial Image Dehazing

1) Mathematical Models: When meeting the hazy weather, the sunlight toward the camera will be changed to be atmosphere light A because of the floating particles. Meanwhile, light from the scene is attenuated to be medium transmission map T. The hazy images are formed by the joint action of the atmosphere light A and medium transmission map T, which can be well described by the Atmospheric Scattering Model (ASM) with the following formula:

$$H(x) = I(x)T(x) + A(1 - T(x)),$$
(1)

where, x is the pixel location, H(x) and I(x) represent the hazy image and its corresponding clean image, respectively. A is the global atmosphere light. T(x) is the medium transmission map, which is mainly determined by the scene depth of the image with the following formula:

$$T(x) = e^{-\beta d(x)},\tag{2}$$

where,  $\beta$  is the atmosphere scattering parameter, and d(x) is the scene depth.

2) Power Line Aerial Image Dehazing Datasets: According to Equation (1) and Equation (2), we can see that the hazy process is determined by three parameters of A,  $\beta$  and d(x). Therefore, to simulate various scenarios of hazy conditions, the values of A are randomly set from 0.4 to 0.6 and the values of  $\beta$  are randomly set from  $5e^{-6}$  to  $7e^{-6}$ . Also, TABLE I

SUMMARIZATION OF THE PROPOSED PUBLIC DATASETS FOR POWER LINE AERIAL IMAGE RESTORATION UNDER ADVERSE WEATHER (PLAIR-AW) TASK. '-' MEANS THERE IS NO SUBSET IN THIS DATASET.

Dataset	Туре	Subset	Size	Numbers	train/test	Download Link
HazeCPLID	Dehazing	-	84×84	848	700/148	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Dehazing-DataSet.md
HazeTTPLA	Dehazing	-	512×512	1242	1000/242	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Dehazing-DataSet.md
HazeInsPLA	D Dehazing	-	1920×1080	10,607	7981/2626	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Dehazing-DataSet.md
RainCPLID	Deraining	RainCPLID-L/H	84×84	848	700/148	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Deraining-Datasets.md
RainTTPLA	Deraining	RainTTPLA-L/H	512×512	1242	1000/242	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Deraining-Datasets.md
RainInsPLAI	Deraining	RainInsPLAD-L/H	1920×1080	10,607	7981/2626	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Deraining-Datasets.md
SnowCPLID	Desnowing	SnowCPLID-S/M/L	84×84	848	700/148	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Desnowing-Datasets.md
SnowTTPLA	Desnowing	SnowTTPLA-S/M/L	512×512	1242	1000/242	https://github.com/ntuhubin/PLAIR-AW/blob/main/Desnowing-Datasets.md



Fig. 2. (a) The exemplar images of the proposed HazeCPLID, HazeTTPLA, HazeInsPLAD, RainCPLID-L, RainTTPLA-H, RainTTPLA-L, RainTTPLA-H, RainInsPLAD-L, RainInsPLAD-H, SnowCPLID-S, SnowCPLID-M, SnowCPLID-H, SnowCPLID-M, SnowCPLID-M, SnowCPLID-H datasets. (b) The information loss of each proposed dataset is compared with its clean counterpart, which is measured by the Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR). (c) The performance ranking of the baseline methods.

d(x) is selected as the average distance of the UAVs from the ground. The above operations are implemented on the public CPLID [12], TTPLA [10], InsPLAD [13] datasets, thus producing the following dehazing datasets:

- \* HazeCPLID: This dataset is created based on CPLID [12], which consists of 848 pairs of hazy and clean images. The size of images is  $84 \times 84$ . The total images are divided into 700 and 148 for training and testing, respectively.
- \* HazeTTPLA: This dataset is created based on TTPLA [10], which consists of 1242 paired hazy and clean images with the size of 512×512 pixels. The total images are divided into 1000 and 242 for training and testing, respectively.
- \* HazeInsPLAD: This dataset is created based on InsPLAD [13], which consists of 10,607 paired snowy and clean images in 1920×1080 resolution. The total images are divided into 7981 and 2626 images for training and testing.

# B. Power Line Aerial Image Deraining

1) Mathematical Models: Owing to complication of the rainy condition, various mathematical models, such as Additive Composite Model (ACM) [36], [37], Screen-Blend Model (SBM) [38], Occlusion-aware Hybrid Rain Model (OHRM) [39], Comprehensive Rain Model (CRM) [16], have been proposed. Since ACM, SBM, OHRM can be viewed as a simplified case of CRM, we use CRM as the mathematical model to describe the physical process of rainy images:

$$R(x) = (1 - \alpha(x))[\beta I(x) + (1 - \beta)A + \sum_{l=1}^{L} S_{l}(x)] + \alpha(x)M(x),$$
(3)

where R(x) and I(x) denote the rainy image and its corresponding clean image, respectively.  $S_l(x)$  is the *l*-th rain streak layer.  $\beta$  and A respectively denote atmospheric transmission and the global atmospheric light. M(x) is the rain reliance map and  $\alpha(x)$  is an alpha matting map, which is:

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in \Omega_s, \\ 0, & \text{if } x \notin \Omega_s, \end{cases}$$
(4)

where  $\Omega_s$  is defined as the rain-occluded region.

2) Power Line Aerial Image Deraining Datasets: From Equation (3), it notes that CRM thoroughly comprises the key factors in the complicated atmospheric process of the rain, i.e., rain streaks, raindrops, and mist-like phenomenon. Consequently, we synthesize sharp lines and transparent circles



Fig. 3. Illustration of baseline methods for the new Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW) task. These baseline methods are broadly categorized into three families of (I) Single adverse weather removal, (II) Multiple adverse weather removal, and (III) All-in-one adverse weather removal. In the first family, we illustrate the representative methods for each specific adverse weather removal, (a) FFANet [18], (b) AECR-Net [19], (c) Dehazeformer [20] for power line aerial image dehazing, (d) PReNet [21], (e) DRSformer [22] for power line aerial image deraining, (f) LMQFormer [23] for power line aerial image desnowing. The representative methods in the second family include (g) SwinIR [24], (h) Uformer [25], (i) Restormer [26] (j) CAT [27], (k) Stoformer [28], (l) ShuffleFormer [29], (m) CODE [30], (n) ART [31], (o) GRL [32]. The representative methods in the third family include (p) AirNet [33], (q) TransWeather [34], (r) PromptIR [35].

#### TABLE II

SUMMARIZATION OF THE BASELINE METHODS. "CON", "SSIM", "CHAR", "PER", "EDGE", AND "SC" STAND FOR CONTRASTIVE LOSS, STRUCTURAL SIMILARITY LOSS, CHARBONNIER LOSS, PERCEPTUAL LOSS, EDGE LOSS, AND SUPERVISED CONTRASTIVE LOSS, RESPECTIVELY.

Туре	Method	Main Blocks	Structure	Loss Function	Download Link	Venu	Year
	FFANet [18]	Attention	Asymmetric	$\mathscr{L}_1$	https://github.com/zhilin007/FFA-Net	AAAI	2020
	AECR-Net [19]	Attention	U-Net	$\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_{Con}$	https://github. com/GlassyWu/AECR-Net	CVPR	2021
¥ ∣	DehazeFormer [20]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_{1} + \mathscr{L}_{SSIM} + \mathscr{L}_{Per} + \mathscr{L}_{Adv}$	https://github.com/IDKiro/DehazeFormer	TIP	2023
NY I	PReNet [21]	Convolutional	Multi-stage	$\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_{SSIM}$	https://github.com/csdwren/PReNet	CVPR	2019
<i>v</i>	DRSformer [22]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_1$	https://github. com/cschenxiang/DRSformer	CVPR	2023
	LMQFormer [23]	Transformer	Pysic-aware	$\mathscr{L}_{Char} + \mathscr{L}_{Per} + \mathscr{L}_{Edge}$	https://github.com/StephenLinn/LMQFormer	TIP	2023
	SwinIR [24]	Transformer	Asymmetric	$\mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/JingyunLiang/SwinIR	ICCVW	2021
	Uformer [25]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/ZhendongWang6/Uformer	CVPR	2022
	Restormer [26]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_1$	https://github.com/swz30/Restormer	CVPR	2022
Ř	CAT [27]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/zhengchen1999/CAT	NIPS	2022
MA	Stoformer [28]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/jiexiaou/Stoformer	NIPS	2022
Ŭ	ShuffleFormer [29]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/jiexiaou/ ShuffleFormer	ICML	2023
	CODE [30]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_2$	https://github.com/XLearning-SCU/2023-CVPR-CODE	CVPR	2023
	ART [31]	Transformer	Asymmetric	$\mathscr{L}_1 + \mathscr{L}_{Char}$	https://github.com/gladzhang/ART	ICLR	2023
	GRL [32]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_1$	https://github.com/ofsoundof/GRL-Imag Restoration.git	CVPR	2023
Ř	AirNet [33]	Convolutional	Asymmetric	$\mathscr{L}_1 + \mathscr{L}_{SC}$	https://github. com/XLearning-SCU/2022-CVPR-AirNet	CVPR	2022
M.	TransWeather [34]	Transformer	Asymmetric	$\mathscr{L}_1 + \mathscr{L}_{Per}$	https://github.com/jeya-maria-jose/TransWeather	CVPR	2022
Ā	PromptIR [35]	Transformer	U-Net	$\mathscr{L}_1$	https://github.com/va1shn9v/PromptIR	NIPS	2023

to simulate the rain streaks and raindrops by using Photoshop. The combination of the rain streaks and raindrops is referred to as the rain mask. Also, we adopt the synthesized procedure in the dehazing dataset to create the mist-like phenomenon. The synthesized rain mask and haze are superposed upon the clean images from the public CPLID [12], TTPLA [10], In-sPLAD [13] datasets, we get the following deraining datasets:

- \* RainCPLID: This dataset is generated upon CPLID, which has two subsets of RainCPLID-L and RainCPLID-H. The former is produced with light rain streaks, while the latter is produced with heavy rain streaks. Both subsets include 848 pairs of rainy and clean images with the size of  $84 \times 84$ . The images are split into 700 for training, and 148 for testing.
- \* RainTTPLA: This dataset is generated upon TTPLA, having two subsets of RainTTPLA-L and RainTTPLA-H. The former is produced with light rain streaks, while the latter is produced with heavy rain streaks. Both subsets contain 1242 pairs of rainy and clean images with a resolution of 512×512. The total images are divided into 1000, and 242 for training and testing.
- \* RainInsPLAD: This dataset is generated upon InsPLAD, which has two subsets of RainInsPLAD-L and RainInsPLAD-H. The former is produced with light rain streaks, while the latter is produced with heavy rain streaks. Both subsets contain 10,607 pairs of rainy and clean images in 1920×1080 resolution. The total images are divided into 7981 and 2626 images for training and testing, respectively.

## C. Power Line Aerial Image Desnowing

1) Mathematical Models: In snowy conditions, Liu et al. [17] established the following mathematical model:

$$S(x) = J(x)(1 - Z(x)) + C(x)Z(x),$$
(5)

where, S(X) and J(x) denote the snowy image and its corresponding clean image. C(x) represents the snow flakes and Z(x) is a binary mask indicating the location of snow.

2) Power Line Aerial Image Desnowing Datasets: Following Equation (5), we simulate the snow mask and aberration map to generate the snowy images. Specifically, we use Photoshop to generate snowflakes and streaks with different transparencies and sizes in different locations, and then adopt Gaussian blurring on snow particles to produce the aberration map. According to the density of snow particles, the snow mask is further divided into three types small, medium, and large. With the snow mask, the desnowing datasets upon the public CPLID [12] and TTPLA [10] are produced as follows:

- \* SnowCPLID: This dataset is constructed based on CPLID, which provides three kinds of snowy images with different sizes of snow particles, namely, SnowCPLID-S, SnowCPLID-M, and SnowCPLID-L. Each subset has a total number of 848 pairs of snowy and clean images, which are divided into 700, and 148 for training and testing, respectively. The size of images in training and testing sets is 84 × 84.
- \* SnowTTPLA: This dataset is constructed based on TTPLA, which provides three kinds of snowy images with different sizes of snow particles, namely, SnowTTPLA-S, SnowTTPLA-M, and SnowTTPLA-L. Each subset consists of 1,242 paired snowy and clean images totally, which are partitioned into 1,000 and 242 for training and testing, respectively. The images in training and testing sets are in size of 512×512.

**Summary and Challenges:** The details about the task type, subset, image size, image numbers, splits protocol as well as the download link of all the proposed datasets are summarized in Table I. The exemplar images of the proposed datasets are shown in Fig. 2 (a). Moreover, we present the characteristics of the proposed datasets in the following aspects: (1) In HazeCPLID, RainCPLID, and SnowCPLID datasets, the main foreground objects in the images are insulators, which are further categorized into two types of normal and missing-cap fault. The background of the images covers the scenes of cities, rivers, fields, and mountains. In HazeTPLA, RainTTPLA, and SnowTTPLA datasets, the content of images is mainly about the transmission towers and power lines, which are taken from



Fig. 4. Visual comparison results on power line aerial image dehazing task in single-one setting. Please zoom in on the figure for a better view.

different views with noisy backgrounds, e.g., buildings, plants, roads, and lane lines. In HazeInsPLAD and RainInsPLAD datasets, the images contain 17 unique power line components captured from multiple real-world environmental conditions. In conclusion, the proposed datasets cover the main scenarios of power line autonomous inspection, which can provide strong support for future research about the new PAIR-AW task. (2) We use the average Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) to measure the information loss of each proposed dataset compared with its clean counterpart. As shown in Fig. 2 (b), the PSNR of some datasets, such as HazeTTPLA, HazeInsPLAD, are below 20 dB. In addition, the images in all the proposed datasets are aerial images, having special angles, variable target directions, small-sized objects, and complex backgrounds. The above points suggest that the new PAIR-AW task is very challenging with poor yet complex images to be restored.

# **III. BASELINE METHODS**

Image restoration under adverse weather is a classical lowlevel computer vision task, which is well-known as the tasks of image dehazing [40]–[44], image deraining [36], [45] and image desnowing [17]. Many brilliant works [46]–[51] have been proposed to solve these tasks. According to the type number of weather removal, existing methods can be broadly categorized into three groups single adverse weather removal, multiple adverse weather removal, and all-in-one adverse weather removal. We choose the representative methods in each group as the baseline methods for the new task of PLAIR-AW, which will be described as follows:

# A. Single Adverse Weather Removal

Single adverse weather removal is referred to as designing a specific method for a certain weather removal task. In this context, we choose the representative methods of FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19], Dehazeformer [20] for dehazing, PReNet [21], DRSformer [22] for deraining, LMQ-Former [23] for desnowing, which are presented as following:

- ◇ FFANet [18]: The framework of FFANet is shown in Fig. 3 (a). The hazy image is passed into a convolutional layer to extract shallow features, which are then fed into N-group architectures. The output features are concatenated to be fused together by the proposed feature attention module. After that, the features are reconstructed to the clean output with the global residual learning connection.
- AECR-Net [19]: As shown in Fig. 3 (b), it mainly owns autoencoder-like (AE) architecture and constructive learning strategy. Specifically, AE consists of a downsampling module, six feature attention blocks, a dynamic feature enhancement block, an upsampling module, and two adaptive mixup operations. Meanwhile, it set the clean image and the hazy image as the positive and negative samples for the degraded output, thereby yielding the contrastive regularization loss.
- ◊ Dehazeformer [20]: As shown in Fig. 3 (c), it is arranged into a U-shaped structure with basic Dehzeformer blocks, which are improved upon the popular Swin Transformer [52]. The core improvements mainly include the SK fusion and soft reconstruction layers, which have replaced the concatenation fusion layer and global residual learning.

#### TABLE III

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS ON POWER LINE AERIAL IMAGE DEHAZING TASK IN SINGLE-ONE SETTING. THE TOP TWO RESULTS ARE MARKED IN RED AND BLUE, RESPECTIVELY.

Method	HazeC	PLID	HazeT	TPLA	HazeIn	sPLAD	Ave	rage	#Param	#Flops
	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	(M)↓	(G)↓
FFANet [18]	20.75	0.8112	19.69	0.7994	19.54	0.8729	19.99	0.8278	4.45	72.08
AECR-Net [19]	23.35	0.8655	19.87	0.7555	21.75	0.8227	21.65	0.8145	2.59	8.90
Dehazeformer [20]	28.34	0.9616	26.43	0.9524	28.25	0.9816	27.67	0.9652	25.45	69.24
PReNet [21]	24.01	0.9197	19.71	0.8324	22.56	0.8886	22.09	0.8802	0.17	16.56
DRSformer [22]	27.84	0.9675	25.72	0.9608	19.48	0.8718	24.34	0.9333	33.65	55.43
LMQFormer [23]	27.40	0.9623	26.53	0.9493	26.20	0.9709	26.71	0.9608	2.18	5.61
SwinIR [24]	26.24	0.9592	24.54	0.9305	26.57	0.9711	25.78	0.9536	7.78	126.51
Uformer [25]	27.38	0.9621	25.33	0.9433	26.84	0.9740	26.51	0.9598	50.88	89.46
Restormer [26]	27.85	0.9657	28.06	0.9653	28.03	0.9763	27.98	0.9691	28.63	39.71
CAT [27]	26.85	0.9547	26.93	0.9463	27.90	0.9705	27.22	0.9571	25.77	33.95
Stoformer [28]	27.44	0.9653	25.05	0.9499	22.55	0.9308	25.01	0.9486	50.47	123.97
ShuffleFormer [29]	26.69	0.9613	26.85	0.9576	27.81	0.9758	27.11	0.9649	30.75	13.28
CODE [30]	27.18	0.9606	26.59	0.9594	25.47	0.9496	26.41	0.9565	12.23	11.3
ART [31]	27.62	0.9442	25.59	0.8987	27.88	0.9532	27.03	0.9320	25.7	33.71
GRL [32]	24.68	0.9406	21.54	0.9089	25.59	0.9632	23.93	0.9375	3.29	51.86
AirNet [33]	26.40	0.9570	25.43	0.9390	27.28	0.9290	26.37	0.9416	7.6	302.3
TransWeather [34]	25.57	0.8934	22.94	0.8284	24.76	0.9436	24.42	0.8884	38.05	1.56
promptIR [35]	28.06	0.9668	27.47	0.9698	27.60	0.9800	27.71	0.9722	34.12	35.25



Fig. 5. Visual comparison results on power line aerial image deraining task in single-one setting. Please zoom in the figure for a better view.

- ◊ PReNet [21]: As shown in Fig. 3 (d), it begins with a basic shallow residual network with five residual blocks, which are then developed into multiple stages with recursively unfolding operations. Moreover, a recurrent layer is introduced to exploit the dependencies of deep features across recursive stages.
- DRSformer [22]: As is shown in Fig. 3 (e), it takes a U-shaped structure with the basic Sparse Transformer Block (STB). The core elements of STB are Top-k sparse attention (TKSA) and Mixed-scale feed-forward network (MSFN). The former explores a learnable top-k selection

operator to keep the most useful self-attention values for better feature aggregation, while the latter utilizes the multi-scale depth-wise convolution paths to obtain rich multi-scale representations.

LMQFormer [23]: As shown in Fig. 3 (f), it has two paths of Laplace-VQVAE and MQFormer. The first path filters the input image using a Laplace operator and then obtains the coarse mask using a multi-scale encoderdecoder with the Codebook at two low scales. In the second path, the coarse mask and input image are firstly fused and then encoded by two parallel encoders, a hybrid

#### TABLE IV

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS ON POWER LINE AERIAL IMAGE DERAINING TASK IN SINGLE-ONE SETTING. THE TOP TWO RESULTS ARE MARKED IN RED AND BLUE, RESPECTIVELY.

	-		-				-									
Method	RainCl	PLID-L	RainCl	PLID-H	RainT	PLA-L	RainT	PLA-H	RainIns	PLAD-L	RainIns	PLAD-H	Ave	rage	#Param	#Flops
	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	(M)↓	(G)↓
FFANet [18]	29.55	0.9281	26.80	0.8779	30.87	0.9604	28.80	0.9318	29.05	0.9314	27.48	0.9075	28.75	0.9228	4.45	72.08
AECR-Net [19]	29.22	0.8850	26.92	0.8442	27.42	0.8338	26.32	0.8020	31.87	0.9467	30.39	0.9295	28.69	0.8735	2.59	8.90
Dehazeformer [20]	32.61	0.9456	30.73	0.9357	33.70	0.9675	31.24	0.9571	38.01	0.9820	36.07	0.9789	33.72	0.9611	25.45	69.24
PReNet [21]	30.97	0.9263	27.95	0.8892	31.10	0.9515	28.99	0.9300	33.77	0.9538	31.84	0.9380	30.77	0.9314	0.17	16.56
DRSformer [22]	34.75	0.9619	33.03	0.9594	34.57	0.9728	32.61	0.9698	26.69	0.9227	25.89	0.8985	31.25	0.9475	33.65	55.43
LMQFormer [23]	32.31	0.9337	29.84	0.9199	32.26	0.9545	29.55	0.9323	35.95	0.9672	33.64	0.9549	32.25	0.9437	2.18	5.61
SwinIR [24]	30.74	0.9362	28.64	0.9107	31.55	0.9607	28.93	0.9321	35.86	0.9738	33.41	0.9621	31.52	0.9459	7.78	126.51
Uformer [25]	33.45	0.9532	31.93	0.9497	33.13	0.9654	30.91	0.9568	37.57	0.9793	35.24	0.9746	33.70	0.9630	50.88	89.46
Restormer [26]	34.80	0.9616	32.34	0.9574	34.94	0.9755	32.83	0.9721	38.38	0.9825	36.44	0.9800	34.95	0.9715	26.13	35.25
CAT [27]	32.91	0.9428	31.83	0.9433	31.86	0.9584	29.64	0.9440	38.05	0.9802	35.51	0.9728	33.30	0.9569	15.01	22.03
Stoformer [28]	33.39	0.9486	31.00	0.9477	34.42	0.9718	31.74	0.9638	37.77	0.9805	35.38	0.9756	33.28	0.9646	50.47	123.97
ShuffleFormer [29]	34.15	0.9516	32.33	0.9539	33.03	0.9648	30.24	0.9517	38.03	0.9817	36.23	0.9783	34.00	0.9636	30.75	13.28
CODE [30]	32.30	0.9365	31.30	0.9421	31.05	0.9503	29.02	0.9340	37.99	0.9809	36.22	0.9781	32.98	0.9536	12.23	11.3
ART [31]	32.54	0.9450	31.43	0.9446	32.46	0.9608	30.84	0.9466	37.60	0.9796	35.86	0.9755	33.45	0.9586	25.7	33.71
GRL [32]	30.84	0.9219	27.85	0.8858	31.21	0.9556	28.94	0.9300	35.80	0.9761	33.82	0.9676	31.41	0.9395	3.29	51.86
AirNet [33]	31.02	0.9343	28.24	0.8962	31.61	0.9628	28.99	0.9434	37.46	0.9787	35.50	0.9739	32.13	0.9482	7.6	302.3
TransWeather [34]	32.58	0.9298	30.11	0.9205	26.17	0.7621	25.07	0.7243	32.86	0.9357	31.18	0.9242	29.66	0.8661	38.05	1.56
promptIR [35]	34.89	0.9605	33.19	0.9638	35.24	0.9781	33.18	0.9705	37.45	0.9793	35.06	0.9733	34.83	0.9709	34.12	35.25



Fig. 6. Visual comparison results on power line aerial image desnowing task in single-one setting. Please zoom in the figure for a better view.

decoder and a modified ConvNeXtBlock. Finally, Pixel Detail Enhancement (PDE) learns further details on the original scale.

### B. Multiple Adverse Weather Removal

Multiple adverse weather removal is referred to as developing general models customizing for multiple weather removal tasks [53], [54], which has emerged as a hot spot in the image restoration community with the following representatives:

◊ SwinIR [24]: As shown in Fig. 3 (g), it consists of three modules of (1) shallow feature extraction, (2) deep feature extraction, and (3) high-quality image reconstruction. Specifically, the first module is a 3 × 3 convolutional layer. The second module is composed of residual Swin Transformer Blocks, where Swin transformer layers are assembled together with a residual connection. The third module aggregates the shallow and deep features together, which can help the second module focus on highfrequency information.

- Vlformer [25]: As shown in Fig. 3 (h), it mainly arranges the Locally-enhanced Window (LeWin) transformer blocks in a U-shaped structure. LeWin performs non-overlapping window-based self-attention instead of global self-attention. Meanwhile, a learnable multi-scale restoration modulator is added to restore more details.
- Restormer [26]: As shown in Fig. 3 (i), it is generally designed in a multi-scale hierarchical. The core components of the basic block are multi-Dconv head transposed attention (MDTA) and Gated-Dconv feed-forward network (GDFN). MDTA models global context by performing channels-wised attention rather the spatial-based attention, GDFN introduces the gating mechanism for allowing only the useful information to pass further through the network hierarchy.
- ◊ CAT [27]: As shown in Fig. 3 (j), it consists of three

#### TABLE V

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS ON POWER LINE AERIAL IMAGE DESNOWING TASK IN THE SINGLE-ONE SETTING. THE TOP TWO RESULTS ARE MARKED IN RED AND BLUE, RESPECTIVELY.

	SnowC	PI ID-S	SnowC	PI ID-M	SnowC	PI ID-I	SnowT	TPL A-S	SnowT	грі л.м	SnowT	грі л_і	Ave	rano		
Method	Showe				Showe		Show I		Showi		Show I			age	#Param	#Flops
	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	(M)↓	(G)↓
FFANet [18]	41.30	0.9695	35.98	0.9235	29.86	0.9187	41.12	0.9754	37.86	0.9687	27.48	0.9114	35.6	0.9412	4.45	72.08
AECR-Net [19]	36.07	0.9558	33.19	0.9230	28.96	0.9033	25.72	0.7046	25.23	0.6860	22.63	0.6439	28.63	0.8027	2.59	8.90
Dehazeformer [20]	41.55	0.9753	36.92	0.9442	33.26	0.9450	39.64	0.9800	37.62	0.9778	31.63	0.9527	36.77	0.9625	25.45	69.24
PReNet [21]	38.49	0.9604	34.17	0.9153	31.66	0.9315	39.86	0.9762	37.02	0.9698	27.40	0.9168	34.76	0.9450	0.17	16.56
DRSformer [22]	42.70	0.9816	38.68	0.9558	36.67	0.9675	41.05	0.9771	37.99	0.9696	27.67	0.9184	37.46	0.9616	33.65	55.43
LMQFormer [23]	42.04	0.9749	36.25	0.9286	31.52	0.9294	39.90	0.9773	37.64	0.9736	30.43	0.9412	36.29	0.9541	2.18	5.61
SwinIR [24]	40.94	0.9722	35.40	0.9279	32.53	0.9383	39.66	0.9791	37.54	0.9738	29.53	0.9335	35.93	0.9541	7.78	126.51
Uformer [25]	41.84	0.9765	36.86	0.9405	33.21	0.9484	39.79	0.9805	38.37	0.9785	32.35	0.9549	37.07	0.9632	13.02	21.89
Restormer [26]	42.99	0.9834	38.68	0.9641	36.85	0.9703	41.26	0.9831	39.38	0.9826	33.82	0.9681	38.82	0.9752	28.63	39.71
CAT [27]	41.28	0.9725	35.98	0.9326	30.09	0.9140	39.49	0.9798	37.45	0.9776	30.82	0.9468	35.85	0.9538	25.77	33.95
Stoformer [28]	42.56	0.9816	37.93	0.9584	36.08	0.9644	41.12	0.9768	37.93	0.9698	27.38	0.9087	37.16	0.9599	50.47	123.97
ShuffleFormer [29]	41.67	0.9764	37.08	0.9490	35.09	0.9582	40.60	0.9828	38.78	0.9813	33.14	0.9643	37.72	0.9686	30.75	13.28
CODE [30]	40.30	0.9702	35.06	0.9234	30.45	0.9163	38.68	0.9766	36.69	0.9685	29.63	0.9329	35.13	0.9479	12.23	11.3
ART [31]	40.33	0.9705	35.12	0.9205	29.65	0.9180	40.21	0.9786	37.18	0.9732	30.58	0.9392	35.51	0.9500	25.7	33.71
GRL [32]	40.48	0.9696	35.24	0.9237	29.07	0.9080	39.90	0.9797	37.58	0.9747	28.84	0.9299	35.18	0.9476	3.29	51.86
AirNet [33]	40.20	0.9732	35.25	0.9326	30.42	0.9229	37.55	0.9738	36.35	0.9716	29.28	0.9362	34.50	0.9517	7.6	302.3
TransWeather [34]	33.52	0.9145	31.37	0.8736	27.80	0.8546	25.95	0.7213	25.80	0.7094	23.25	0.6741	27.94	0.7912	38.05	1.56
promptIR [35]	43.39	0.9830	39.48	0.9691	37.50	0.9724	41.59	0.9838	39.32	0.9828	33.29	0.9673	39.09	0.9764	34.12	35.25

#### TABLE VI

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS ON POWER LINE AERIAL IMAGE DEHAZING TASK, DERAINING TASK, AND DESNOWING TASK IN THE ALL-IN-ONE SETTING. THE TOP TWO RESULTS ARE MARKED IN RED AND BLUE, RESPECTIVELY.

		Deha	azing			Dera	ining				Desn	owing			Average	
Method	HazeCPLID		HazeTTPLA		RainCl	PLID-L	RainCH	PLID-H	SnowTTPLA-S		SnowTTPLA-M		SnowTTPLA-L			g.
	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	<b>PSNR</b> ↑	SSIM↑										
FFANet [18]	20.49	0.8274	18.83	0.7941	25.39	0.9276	25.46	0.9007	37.61	0.9706	36.33	0.9670	27.43	0.9160	27.36	0.9004
AECR-Net [19]	21.69	0.8179	19.68	0.7837	26.28	0.8553	25.92	0.8367	24.62	0.7479	24.36	0.7384	22.30	0.6989	23.55	0.7971
Dehazeformer [20]	26.00	0.9611	23.35	0.9133	31.61	0.9541	30.23	0.9393	34.67	0.9632	33.99	0.9648	28.75	0.9248	29.8	0.9458
PReNet [21]	20.86	0.8567	19.05	0.8122	26.05	0.9018	26.10	0.8770	34.83	0.9576	34.47	0.9636	26.99	0.9181	26.90	0.8981
DRSformer [22]	20.89	0.8218	19.01	0.7919	23.74	0.9231	23.60	0.8965	35.36	0.9607	34.87	0.9518	27.86	0.9221	26.47	0.8954
LMQFormer [23]	25.67	0.9519	21.74	0.8813	29.81	0.9316	28.01	0.9178	34.52	0.9487	33.84	0.9550	27.78	0.9265	28.76	0.9304
SwinIR [24]	26.11	0.9527	20.21	0.8520	28.38	0.9307	27.19	0.9031	29.59	0.9275	29.42	0.9308	24.36	0.8895	26.45	0.8649
Uformer [25]	26.04	0.9514	20.23	0.8575	27.64	0.9295	26.46	0.9088	35.26	0.9637	34.91	0.9653	27.21	0.9214	28.25	0.9282
Restormer [26]	27.25	0.9641	21.64	0.8460	31.36	0.9584	30.41	0.9499	33.55	0.9648	34.86	0.9720	29.90	0.9433	29.85	0.9426
CAT [27]	26.33	0.9537	22.19	0.8807	31.30	0.9418	29.45	0.9312	33.23	0.9659	33.21	0.9628	27.97	0.9236	29.09	0.9371
Stoformer [28]	25.44	0.9555	20.92	0.9010	29.67	0.9268	26.99	0.8844	31.33	0.9538	31.34	0.9546	25.39	0.8996	27.29	0.9251
ShuffleFormer [29]	26.11	0.9633	21.92	0.9032	30.25	0.9391	29.38	0.9180	33.49	0.9434	33.41	0.9498	26.86	0.9101	28.77	0.9324
CODE [30]	25.27	0.9529	19.84	0.8012	29.38	0.9356	28.90	0.9323	32.34	0.9557	32.03	0.9540	27.81	0.9272	27.93	0.9227
ART [31]	26.32	0.9302	22.33	0.8557	31.22	0.9360	29.61	0.9222	33.63	0.9625	33.33	0.9591	27.95	0.9249	29.19	0.9272
GRL [32]	24.15	0.9252	19.24	0.8024	27.69	0.9137	27.39	0.8990	31.43	0.9493	31.02	0.9463	25.48	0.9009	26.62	0.9052
AirNet [33]	26.09	0.9510	20.20	0.8830	30.26	0.9445	28.90	0.9270	33.98	0.9647	33.42	0.9624	28.30	0.9300	28.73	0.9375
TransWeather [34]	23.13	0.8755	20.93	0.8334	27.56	0.8700	26.53	0.8572	24.00	0.7524	23.80	0.7503	22.15	0.7050	24.01	0.8062
promptIR [35]	26.56	0.9637	21.71	0.8681	33.44	0.9709	31.97	0.9654	33.92	0.9686	33.40	0.9704	29.91	0.9428	30.13	0.9499

modules of (1) shallow feature extraction, (2) deep feature extraction, and (3) reconstruction. The core component is the second module, which applies a residual connection with the elements of several residual groups and one convolution layer. Each residual group consists of several cross-aggregation transformer blocks and a convolution layer.

- ♦ Stoformer [28]: As shown in Fig. 3 (k), it utilizes a UNet-style network architecture with StoBlock in the encoder and decoder stage. The basic transformer layer in StoBlock is a variant of window-based self-attention with a stochastic window strategy.
- ◊ ShuffleFormer [29]: As shown in Fig. 3 (l), it is established with U-shape architecture using the basic block

of ShuffleBlock. The basic transformer layer in ShuffleBlock enhanced the non-local interactions of the local window transformer by randomly shuffling the input.

- ◇ CODE [30]: As shown in Fig. 3(m), it arranges the basic transformer blocks in a U-shape structure, and each basic block consists of the Condensed Attention (CA) block and the Dual Adaptive (DA) block. CA sequentially performs feature aggregation, attention computation, and feature recovery to efficiently capture the superpixel-wise global feature, while DA takes a dual-way structure in a dynamic weighting fashion to distribute the superpixel-wise globality into each pixel.
- ◊ ART [31]: As shown in Fig. 3 (n), it takes the asymmetric auto-encoder architecture, which firstly extracts shallow



Fig. 7. Visual comparison results on power line aerial image dehazing, draining, and desnowing tasks in the all-in-one setting. Please zoom in the figure for a better view.

features with a  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layer, then extracts deep features with several residual groups, and finally refine the restoration results with a  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layer. The core element of each residual group is two successive attention blocks of Dense Attention Block (DAB) and Sparse Attention Block (SAB).

◇ GRL [32]: As shown in Fig. 3 (o), it mainly contains (1) feature extraction, (2) representation learning, and (3) image reconstruction. The second part is the backbone network, which takes residual connection with six transformer stage and a convolutional layer. The transformer layer implements a parallel computation of the anchored stripe self-attention, window self-attention, and channelattention enhanced convolution.

# C. All-in-one Adverse Weather Removal

All-in-one adverse weather removal is referred to as developing a unified architecture to be capable of dealing with multiple adverse weather removal tasks simultaneously [55], [56], which has developed to be a new research trend in the image restoration community with the following representatives.

- ◊ AirNet [33]: As shown in Fig. 3 (p), it mainly contains Contrastive-Based Degraded Encoder (CBDE) and Degradation-Guided Restoration Network (DGRN). The core component in CBDE is the supervised contrastive learning to discriminate degradation types, which can efficiently guide image restoration in DGRN.
- TransWeather [34]: As shown in Fig. 3 (q), the framework of TransWeather generally follows auto-encoder architecture. The encoder has intra-patch transformer blocks to extract features from smaller sub-patches created from

the main patch. The transformer decoder has learnable weather-type queries to obtain the task features. Then, hierarchical features and task features are forwarded to a convolutional projection block to obtain a clean image.

◊ PromptIR [35]: As shown in Fig. 3 (r), it is designed upon Restormer [26] with a new plug-and-play prompt module. The new module encodes degradation-specific information with a set of tunable parameters, which can dynamically guide the decoder to restore the image with various degradation types.

**Remarks and Potentials:** The baseline methods are summarized in Table II. All the baseline methods are extensively compared in both single-one and all-in-one settings in our work. We calculate the average results over all the datasets, tasks as well as settings in PSNR. From the result shown in Fig.2 (c), we can see Restormer [26] and PromptIR [35] comprehensively rank the first place and the second place, respectively. The triumph of these two methods is mainly attributed to the powerful long-range dependency modeling capability of the transformers. Yet, the transformers suffer heavy computational and parameter capacity burdens due to their multi-head selfattention, which can not meet the resource-limited application of power line autonomous inspection. Future work is needed to focus on developing new specific restoration models targeting power line autonomous inspection tasks.

## **IV. EXPERIMENTS**

# A. Restoration Evaluation

1) Implementation Details: All the baseline methods are extensively compared in both single-one and all-in-one settings. The single-one setting trains separate models with

#### TABLE VII

SEGMENTATION PERFORMANCE COMPARISON AMONG THE BASELINE METHODS, NORMAL CONDITION AS WELL AS THE METHOD WITHOUT PAIR-AW (W/O PAIR-AW). THE TOP TWO RESULTS ACHIEVED BY THE BASELINE METHODS ARE MARKED WITH RED AND BLUE, RESPECTIVELY. THE RESULT IN NORMAL CONDITION IS MARKED IN BOLD. THE RESULT OF W/O PAIR-AW IS MARKED WITH AN UNDERLINE.

Method		Н	azeTTF	PLA			Rai	inTTPL	А-Н		SnowTTPLA-L					
Memou	$\overline{AP_b^{50}}$	$AP_m^{50}$	$AP_b^{75}$	$AP_m^{75}$	$AP_b^{avg}$	$\overline{AP_b^{50}}$	$AP_m^{50}$	$AP_b^{75}$	$AP_m^{75}$	$AP^{avg}$	$\overline{AP_b^{50}}$	$AP_m^{50}$	$AP_b^{75}$	$AP_m^{75}$	$AP^{avg}$	
Normal	57.63	42.26	33.78	21.74	38.85	57.63	42.26	33.78	21.74	38.85	57.63	42.26	33.78	21.74	38.85	
w/o PAIR-AW	53.98	33.56	30.47	18.14	34.03	53.72	37.42	30.35	19.60	35.27	53.95	37.07	28.95	19.62	34.89	
FFANet [18]	52.50	35.04	29.47	18.27	33.82	55.10	41.45	30.90	21.11	37.14	54.47	36.89	28.47	19.18	34.75	
AECR-Net [19]	42.53	29.77	19.40	13.62	26.33	45.23	31.37	20.74	13.69	27.75	44.57	28.04	23.73	11.48	26.95	
Dehazeformer [20]	56.14	42.73	31.34	20.31	37.63	55.91	41.75	32.31	21.26	37.80	56.41	41.45	29.23	20.06	36.78	
PReNet [21]	52.76	41.60	25.65	17.83	34.46	55.35	41.49	30.90	20.66	37.10	54.12	37.26	28.04	18.58	34.50	
DRSformer [22]	50.25	35.50	25.35	14.70	31.45	55.29	41.09	31.27	20.52	37.04	54.03	37.40	28.54	18.99	34.74	
LMQFormer [23]	50.71	35.53	26.78	17.53	32.63	54.16	41.09	31.34	20.72	36.82	54.72	39.13	28.90	19.72	35.61	
SwinIR [24]	57.25	40.87	33.33	20.79	38.06	54.98	41.39	31.44	20.36	37.04	55.68	37.54	29.54	19.05	35.45	
Uformer [25]	56.24	42.05	34.09	20.56	38.23	54.44	41.36	31.02	20.64	36.86	55.65	40.66	31.50	19.84	36.91	
Restormer [26]	55.90	40.55	30.85	18.75	36.51	55.27	41.65	31.44	20.78	37.28	55.70	40.93	30.99	18.88	36.62	
CAT [27]	55.69	40.20	32.96	20.41	37.31	54.52	41.73	31.98	20.92	37.28	55.30	35.47	28.10	19.30	34.54	
Stoformer [28]	56.49	42.00	32.55	20.73	37.94	55.78	42.27	31.43	20.88	37.59	56.08	40.24	29.07	20.81	36.55	
ShuffleFormer [29]	53.25	39.05	28.97	18.04	34.82	55.09	41.46	31.35	21.23	37.25	55.92	41.26	30.28	19.50	36.74	
CODE [30]	57.03	41.09	31.10	21.91	37.78	55.04	41.53	31.83	20.84	37.31	55.54	38.11	29.55	19.87	35.76	
ART [31]	53.86	40.10	32.96	20.41	36.83	55.01	41.44	31.97	21.14	37.39	55.11	39.42	29.66	19.91	36.02	
GRL [32]	55.96	37.48	30.69	20.96	36.27	54.39	41.03	31.24	20.35	36.87	55.60	37.12	30.64	19.35	35.67	
AirNet [33]	54.70	36.03	29.08	19.71	34.88	54.29	41.36	30.87	20.62	36.78	54.57	38.27	28.16	19.47	35.09	
TransWeather [34]	29.28	20.13	11.76	7.79	17.24	31.38	21.92	13.53	9.11	18.98	44.71	30.53	20.74	14.37	27.58	
promptIR [35]	54.80	38.64	30.40	19.53	35.84	55.51	41.51	30.95	20.46	37.10	56.94	41.85	30.93	19.75	37.36	

training datasets proposed in power line aerial image dehazing task, draining, and desnowing tasks. The all-in-one setting trains a unified model by combining partial training datasets in each restoration task, i.e, HazeCPLID and HazeTTPLA in the power line aerial image dehazing task, RainCPLID-L, RainCPLID-H in power line aerial image deraining task, and SnowTTPLA-S, SnowTTPLA-M and SnowTTPLA-L in power line aerial image desnowing task. For all the datasets, Adam with a momentum of  $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999$  and a weight decay of 5e-4 is employed as the optimizer. The maximal epoch number is set to be 200 with the batch size of 8. Following [57]-[62], we select popular metrics of Peak Signalto-Noise Ratio (PSNR) and Structure Similarity (SSIM) as the quantitative measures. Higher values of these metrics indicate better performance of the methods. Partial trained models have been uploaded to Cloud Drive.<sup>1</sup>

2) Results: In a single-one setting, the quantitative comparison results on power line aerial image dehazing, deraining, and desnowing tasks are reported in Table III, Table IV, and Table V, respectively. From the results, we can see that: (1) On the whole, the transformer-based methods like Restormer [26], CAT [27], ART [31], promptIR [35] perform better than the CNNs-based methods like FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19] on power line aerial image dehazing, deraining and desnowing tasks in single-one setting. (2) From the average results in Table III, Table IV, and Table V, we can see that Restormer [26] and promptIR [35] comprehensively achieve the top two performance in both PSNR and SSIM. We further show the visualization comparison results of power line aerial image dehazing, deraining, and desnowing tasks in Fig. 4, Fig. 5, Fig. 6, respectively. The visualization results appear to be consistent with the above quantitative results, where Restormer [26] and promptIR [35] can generate visually pleasing results with better structures and details. In contrast, some CNNs-based methods like FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19] still have a faint mist in the restored images as shown in Fig. 4. As shown in Fig. 5. there still exists rain streak residuals in the restored images of FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19]. As shown in Fig. 6, FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19] fail to recover well with some snowflake residuals.

In the all-in-one setting, quantitative comparison results are reported in Table VI. From the results, it can be observed that: (1) Compared with the results in single-one setting shown in Table III, Table IV, and Table V, the performance of all the methods has significantly reduced, illustrating the all-inone experimental setting is more challenging than the singone setting. (2) Comprehensively speaking, Restormer [26] and promptIR [35] rank the best and second place in both PSNR and SSIM. Their success is mainly attributed to the advanced transformer blocks, which implement spatial-wise self-attention operations. We further show the visualization comparison results of power line aerial image dehazing, deraining, and desnowing tasks in an all-in-one setting in Fig. 7. The visualization results appear to be consistent with the above quantitative results, where Restormer [26] and promptIR [35] can generate visually pleasing results with better structures and details. In contrast, some methods like FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19] fail to recover well with distorted results.

## B. Autonomous Inspection-based Evaluation

To investigate whether the Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW) task benefits power line autonomous inspection, we apply the state-of-theart real-time instance segmentation model of YOLACT [11] to evaluate the images after PAIR-AW task. This experiment is implemented on HazeTTPLA, RainTTPLA-H, and SnowTTPLA-L. Following [63], we calculate the standard box Average Precision (AP) under different IoU thresholds as the evaluation metric. The average precision is calculated for both bounding boxes and instance mask, which are denoted as  $AP_b$ and  $AP_m$ , respectively. The precision scores are evaluated with two cases, i.e. AP with the overlap value of 50% and 75%, resulting in  $AP_b^{50\%}$ ,  $AP_b^{75\%}$ ,  $AP_m^{50\%}$ ,  $AP_m^{75\%}$ . We also calculate the average result over  $AP_b^{50\%}$ ,  $AP_b^{55\%}$ ,  $AP_m^{50\%}$ ,  $AP_m^{75\%}$  to comprehensively compare the methods, which is denoted as  $AP^{avg}$ . The segmentation results of each baseline method are shown in Table VII.

From the results, we have the following observation: (1) On the power line aerial image dehazing task, compared with the method of w/o PAIR-AW, FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19], DRSformer [22], LMQFormer [23], TransWeather [34] do not obtain improvements. On the power line aerial image deraining task, compared with the method of w/o PAIR-AW, AECR-Net [19], TransWeather [34] do not obtain improvements. On the power line aerial image desnowing task, compared with the method of w/o PAIR-AW, FFANet [18], AECR-Net [19], PReNet [21], DRSformer [22], CAT [27], TransWeather [34] do not obtain improvements. The above analyses suggest these methods fail in the autonomous inspection-based evaluation. (2) The best performance is achieved by Uformer [25], Dehazeformer [20], promptIR [35] on dehazning task, deraning task, and desnowing task, respectively. These methods significantly outperform w/o PAIR-AW by a large gain, suggesting the proposed new task can benefit the power line autonomous inspection under adverse weather. (3) The baseline methods with the best performance are still inferior to the results in normal conditions, demonstrating more advanced image restoration models need to be designed in future work.

# V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Under adverse weather conditions, the overhead power lines are more susceptible to malfunctions, thereby strengthening inspection is crucial to ensure the stable operation of the power system. In this context, autonomous inspection is greatly superior to manual inspection in the aspects of safety and efficiency. However, our investigation in this paper has verified that aerial images captured in adverse weather are detrimental to modern autonomous inspection methods based on deep learning. To address this problem, we propose a new task of Power Line Aerial Image Restoration under Adverse Weather (PLAIR-AW) to enhance the visible quality of aerial images. Meanwhile, we formulate the general solution pipeline based on deep learning for this new task. Further, to realize the solution, we construct numerous synthetic datasets following reasonable mathematical models. These datasets include HazeCPLID, HazeTTPLA, HazeInsPLAD for power line aerial image dehazing task, RainCPLID, RainTTPLA, RainInsPLAD for the power line aerial image deraining task, and SnowCPLID, SnowTTPLA for the power line aerial image desnowing task. Moreover, we also provide numerous excellent baseline methods for the new task. These baseline methods have been extensively evaluated on the proposed datasets in both single-one and all-in-one settings.

Since PLAIR-AW is a new task, much work is needed to be carried out in the future. For example, (1) The proposed datasets are artificially synthesized, having bias from the real-world degraded aerial images under adverse weather, thereby producing the domain shift problem in the realistic evaluation. Thus, future work will collect sufficient real-world degraded aerial images, which can assist the existing proposed synthesized datasets to develop the semi-supervised learning strategy. (2) Despite the promising performance of baselines in PLAIR-AW tasks, they still exist the following two issues. On the one hand, they are not customized for aerial images, which have characteristics of special angles, variable target directions, small-sized objects, and complex backgrounds. Future works will concentrate on enhancing the representation of the baseline methods to deal with the hard aerial image restoration. On the other hand, they are not lightweight enough to satisfy the resource-limited demands of UAVs. Thus, future work will focus on model compression techniques to reduce the parameter capacity of restoration models.

## REFERENCES

- J. Zhu, W. Meng, M. Sun, J. Yang, and Z. Song, "Fllf: A fast-lightweight location detection framework for false data injection attacks in smart grids," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 911–920, 2023.
- [2] C. Hu, J. Yan, and X. Liu, "Reinforcement learning-based adaptive feature boosting for smart grid intrusion detection," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 3150–3163, 2022.
- [3] M. M. Hosseini, A. Umunnakwe, M. Parvania, and T. Tasdizen, "Intelligent damage classification and estimation in power distribution poles using unmanned aerial vehicles and convolutional neural networks," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 3325–3333, 2020.
- [4] N. Wei, X. Li, J. Jin, P. Chen, and S. Sun, "Detecting insulator strings as linked chain structure in smart grid inspection," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inf.*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 9019–9027, 2023.
- [5] Q. Cao, Y. Chen, C. Ma, and X. Yang, "Few-shot rotation-invariant aerial image semantic segmentation," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 1–13, 2023.
- [6] L. Li, X. Yao, X. Wang, D. Hong, G. Cheng, and J. Han, "Robust few-shot aerial image object detection via unbiased proposals filtration," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 1–13, 2023.
- [7] Y. Yu, X. Yang, J. Li, and X. Gao, "Object detection for aerial images with feature enhancement and soft label assignment," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 1–16, 2022.
- [8] K. Yang, G.-S. Xia, Z. Liu, M. Pelillo, and L. Zhang, "Asymmetric siamese networks for semantic change detection in aerial images," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 1–18, 2022.
- [9] Y. Liu, Z. Xiong, Y. Yuan, and Q. Wang, "Transcending pixels: boosting saliency detection via scene understanding from aerial imagery," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [10] R. Abdelfattah, X. Wang, and S. Wang, "TTPLA: an aerial-image dataset for detection and segmentation of transmission towers and power lines," in *Proc. Asian Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2020, pp. 1–17.
- [11] D. Bolya, C. Zhou, F. Xiao, and Y. J. Lee, "YOLACT: Real-time instance segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2019.
- [12] X. Tao, D. Zhang, Z. Wang, X. Liu, H. Zhang, and D. Xu, "Detection of power line insulator defects using aerial images analyzed with convolutional neural network," *IEEE Trans. Syst., man, cyber. : Syst.*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1486–1498, 2020.
- [13] V. Silva, H. Felix, F. Simoes, V. Teichrieb, and M. Santos, "InsPLAD: a sataset and benchmark for power line asset inspection in uav images," *Inter. J. Remote Sensing*, vol. 44, no. 23, pp. 7294–7320, 2023.
- [14] S. G. Narasimhan and S. K. Nayar, "Contrast restoration of weather degraded images," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 713–724, 2003.
- [15] S. K. Nayar and S. G. Narasimhan, "Vision in bad weather," in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf.Comput. Vis. IEEE, 1999, pp. 820–827.
- [16] W. Yang, J. Liu, and J. Feng, "Frame-consistent recurrent video deraining with dual-level flow," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2019, pp. 1661–1670.

- [17] Y. Liu, D. Jaw, S. Huang, and J. Hwang, "DesnowNet: dontext-aware deep network for snow removal," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 3064–3073, 2018.
- [18] X. Qin, Z. Wang, Y. Bai, X. Xie, and H. Jia, "FFA-Net: feature fusion attention network for single image dehazing," in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 11908–11915.
- [19] H. Wu, Y. Qu, S. Lin, J. Zhou, R. Qiao, Z. Zhang, Y. Xie, and L. Ma, "Contrastive learning for compact single image dehazing," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2021, pp. 10551– 10560.
- [20] Y. Song, Z. He, H. Qian, and X. Du, "Vision transformers for single image dehazing," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 32, pp. 1927–1941, 2023.
- [21] D. Ren, W. Zuo, Q. Hu, P. Zhu, and D. Meng, "Progressive image deraining networks: A better and simpler baseline," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2019, pp. 3937–3946.
- [22] X. Chen, H. Li, M. Li, and J. Pan, "Learning a sparse transformer network for effective image deraining," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 5896–5905.
- [23] J. Lin, N. Jiang, Z. Zhang, W. Chen, and T. Zhao, "LMQFormer: a laplace-prior-guided mask query transformer for lightweight snow removal," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 2023.
- [24] J. Liang, J. Cao, G. Sun, K. Zhang, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte, "SwinIR: image restoration using swin transformer," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf.Comput. Vis.*, 2021, pp. 1833–1844.
- [25] Z. Wang, X. Cun, J. Bao, W. Zhou, J. Liu, and H. Li, "Uformer: a general u-shaped transformer for image restoration," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 17683–17693.
- [26] S. W. Zamir, A. Arora, S. Khan, M. Hayat, F. S. Khan, and M. Yang, "Restormer: efficient transformer for high-resolution image restoration," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 5728–5739.
- [27] Z. Chen, Y. Zhang, J. Gu, L. Kong, X. Yuan *et al.*, "Cross aggregation transformer for image restoration," *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, pp. 25478–25490, 2022.
- [28] J. Xiao, X. Fu, F. Wu, and Z. Zha, "Stochastic window transformer for image restoration," *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 35, pp. 9315–9329, 2022.
- [29] J. Xiao, X. Fu, M. Zhou, H. Liu, and Z. Zha, "Random shuffle transformer for image restoration," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.* PMLR, 2023, pp. 38039–38058.
- [30] H. Zhao, Y. Gou, B. Li, D. Peng, J. Lv, and X. Peng, "Comprehensive and delicate: an efficient transformer for image restoration," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 14122– 14132.
- [31] J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Gu, Y. Zhang, L. Kong, and Y. Xin, "Accurate image restoration with attention retractable transformer," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*, 2023.
- [32] Y. Li, Y. Fan, X. Xiang, D. Demandolx, R. Ranjan, R. Timofte, and L. Van Gool, "Efficient and explicit modelling of image hierarchies for image restoration," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 18 278–18 289.
- [33] B. Li, X. Liu, P. Hu, Z. Wu, J. Lv, and X. Peng, "All-in-one image restoration for unknown corruption," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 17452–17462.
- [34] J. M. J. Valanarasu, R. Yasarla, and V. M. Patel, "TransWeather: transformer-based restoration of images degraded by adverse weather conditions," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 2353–2363.
- [35] V. Potlapalli, S. W. Zamir, S. Khan, and F. S. Khan, "PromptIR: prompting for all-in-one blind image restoration," arXiv:2306.13090, 2023.
- [36] W. Yang, R. T. Tan, S. Wang, Y. Fang, and J. Liu, "Single image deraining: from model-based to data-driven and beyond," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 43, no. 11, pp. 4059–4077, 2020.
- [37] Y. Li, R. T. Tan, X. Guo, J. Lu, and M. S. Brown, "Rain streak removal using layer priors," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2016, pp. 2736–2744.
- [38] Y. Luo, Y. Xu, and H. Ji, "Removing rain from a single image via discriminative sparse coding," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf.Comput. Vis.*, 2015, pp. 3397–3405.
- [39] J. Liu, W. Yang, S. Yang, and Z. Guo, "Erase or fill? deep joint recurrent rain removal and reconstruction in videos," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2018, pp. 3233–3242.
- [40] K. He, J. Sun, and X. Tang, "Single image haze removal using dark channel prior," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* IEEE, 2009, pp. 1956–1963.

- [41] J. Gui, X. Cong, Y. Cao, W. Ren, J. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Cao, and D. Tao, "A comprehensive survey and taxonomy on single image dehazing based on deep learning," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 13s, pp. 1–37, 2023.
- [42] X. Guo, Y. Yang, C. Wang, and J. Ma, "Image dehazing via enhancement, restoration, and fusion: a survey," *Information Fusion*, vol. 86, pp. 146–170, 2022.
- [43] M. Singh, V. Laxmi, and P. Faruki, "Visibility enhancement and dehazing: Research contribution challenges and direction," *Comput. Science Review*, vol. 44, p. 100473, 2022.
- [44] B. Cai, X. Xu, K. Jia, C. Qing, and D. Tao, "DehazeNet: an end-to-end system for single image haze removal," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 5187–5198, 2016.
- [45] Z. Zhang, Y. Wei, H. Zhang, Y. Yang, S. Yan, and M. Wang, "Datadriven single image deraining: a comprehensive review and new perspectives," *Pattern Recognit.*, 2023.
- [46] B. Li, X. Peng, Z. Wang, J. Xu, and D. Feng, "AOD-Net: all-in-one dehazing network," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf.Comput. Vis.*, 2017, pp. 4770–4778.
- [47] X. Fu, B. Liang, Y. Huang, X. Ding, and J. Paisley, "Lightweight pyramid networks for image deraining," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1794–1807, 2019.
- [48] Y. Qiu, K. Zhang, C. Wang, W. Luo, H. Li, and Z. Jin, "MB-TaylorFormer: multi-branch efficient transformer expanded by taylor formula for image dehazing," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 12802–12813.
- [49] H. Dong, J. Pan, L. Xiang, Z. Hu, X. Zhang, F. Wang, and M. Yang, "Multi-scale boosted dehazing network with dense feature fusion," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2020, pp. 2157– 2167.
- [50] J. Xiao, X. Fu, A. Liu, F. Wu, and Z. Zha, "Image de-raining transformer," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 2022.
- [51] K. Zhang, R. Li, Y. Yu, W. Luo, and C. Li, "Deep dense multi-scale network for snow removal using semantic and depth priors," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 30, pp. 7419–7431, 2021.
- [52] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin Transformer: hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2021, pp. 10012–10022.
- [53] Z. Tu, H. Talebi, H. Zhang, F. Yang, P. Milanfar, A. Bovik, and Y. Li, "MAXIM: Multi-axis mlp for image processing," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 5769–5780.
- [54] M. Zhou, J. Huang, C. Guo, and C. Li, "Fourmer: an efficient global modeling paradigm for image restoration," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.* PMLR, 2023, pp. 42 589–42 601.
- [55] H. Chen, Y. Wang, T. Guo, C. Xu, Y. Deng, Z. Liu, S. Ma, C. Xu, C. Xu, and W. Gao, "Pre-trained image processing transformer," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2021, pp. 12299– 12310.
- [56] W. Chen, Z. Huang, C. Tsai, H. Yang, J. Ding, and S. Kuo, "Learning multiple adverse weather removal via two-stage knowledge learning and multi-contrastive regularization: Toward a unified model," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2022, pp. 17653– 17662.
- [57] Y. Zheng, J. Zhan, S. He, J. Dong, and Y. Du, "Curricular contrastive regularization for physics-aware single image dehazing," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 5785–5794.
- [58] X. Liu, Z. Shi, Z. Wu, J. Chen, and G. Zhai, "GridDehazeNet+: an enhanced multi-scale network with intra-task knowledge transfer for single image dehazing," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transport. Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 870–884, 2022.
- [59] Y. Guo, Y. Gao, W. Liu, Y. Lu, J. Qu, S. He, and W. Ren, "SCANet: self-paced semi-curricular attention network for non-homogeneous image dehazing," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 1884–1893.
- [60] M. Cao, Z. Gao, B. Ramesh, T. Mei, and J. Cui, "A two-stage densityaware single image deraining method," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 30, pp. 6843–6854, 2021.
- [61] X. Zhu, S. Li, Y. Gan, Y. Zhang, and B. Sun, "Multi-stream fusion network with generalized smooth 11 loss for single image dehazing," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 30, pp. 7620–7635, 2021.
- [62] B. Cheng, J. Li, Y. Chen, and T. Zeng, "Snow mask guided adaptive residual network for image snow removal," *Conf. Comput. Image Understand.*, vol. 236, 2023.
- [63] J. He, P. Li, Y. Geng, and X. Xie, "FastInst: A simple query-based model for real-time instance segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*, 2023, pp. 23 663–23 672.