

MB-TaylorFormer V2: Improved Multi-branch Linear Transformer Expanded by Taylor Formula for Image Restoration

Zhi Jin, Yuwei Qiu, Kaihao Zhang, Hongdong Li, Wenhan Luo

Abstract—Recently, Transformer networks have demonstrated outstanding performance in the field of image restoration due to the global receptive field and adaptability to input. However, the quadratic computational complexity of Softmax-attention poses a significant limitation on its extensive application in image restoration tasks, particularly for high-resolution images. To tackle this challenge, we propose a novel variant of the Transformer. This variant leverages the Taylor expansion to approximate the Softmax-attention and utilizes the concept of norm-preserving mapping to approximate the remainder of the first-order Taylor expansion, resulting in a linear computational complexity. Moreover, we introduce a multi-branch architecture featuring multi-scale patch embedding into the proposed Transformer, which has four distinct advantages: 1) various sizes of the receptive field; 2) multi-level semantic information; 3) flexible shapes of the receptive field; 4) accelerated training and inference speed. Hence, the proposed model, named the second version of Taylor formula expansion-based Transformer (for short MB-TaylorFormer V2) has the capability to concurrently process coarse-to-fine features, capture long-distance pixel interactions with limited computational cost, and improve the approximation of the Taylor expansion remainder. Experimental results across diverse image restoration benchmarks demonstrate that MB-TaylorFormer V2 achieves state-of-the-art performance in multiple image restoration tasks, such as image dehazing, deraining, desnowing, motion deblurring, and denoising, with very little computational overhead. The source code is available at <https://github.com/FVL2020/MB-TaylorFormerV2>.

Index Terms—Image restoration, linear Transformer, Taylor formula, multi-branch structure, multi-scale patch embedding

arXiv:2501.04486v1 [cs.CV] 8 Jan 2025

1 INTRODUCTION

THE evolution of image restoration techniques has shifted from strategies reliant on prior information [1] to deep learning-based models. Over the past decade, advancements in deep image restoration networks, characterized by sophisticated enhancements like multi-scale information fusion [2], [3], refined convolution variants [4], and attention mechanisms [5], have significantly improved performance. Recently, the Transformer architecture has been widely used in computer vision tasks [6], [7]. However, there are two challenges when applied in image restoration tasks: 1) the quadratic computational complexity of Transformer; 2) the fixed-scale tokens generated by existing visual Transformer networks [8], [9] generally through fixed convolution kernels. Thus, further innovation

This work was supported in part by: the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant 62071500, U24A20251); Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (Grant JCYJ20230807111107015).

Zhi Jin is School of Intelligent Systems Engineering, Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518107, P.R. China; with Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Fire Science and Technology, Guangzhou 510006, P.R. China (e-mail: jinzh26@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

Yuwei Qiu is with the School of Intelligent Systems Engineering, Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, 518107, Guangdong, P.R. China (e-mail: qiuyw9@mail2.sysu.edu.cn)

Kaihao Zhang is with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Shenzhen Campus of Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518055, P.R. China (super.khzhang@gmail.com).

Hongdong Li is with the School of Engineering and Computer Science, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2600, Australia (hongdong.li@gmail.com).

Wenhan Luo is with the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong (whluo.china@gmail.com).

Corresponding authors: Wenhan Luo, Kaihao Zhang.




Fig. 1: Improvement of MB-TaylorFormer V2 over the SOTA approaches. The circle size is proportional to the number of model parameters.

is required to address these challenges.

For the first challenge, previous works have reduced the computational complexity of Transformer through various methods, such as shifted window [10], channel self-attention [8], and kernel functions [11]. However, these approaches often lead to some shortcomings, such as reduced receptive field, a lack of interaction between

pixels, value approximation deficiencies, and attention focus challenges. Therefore, we propose a second version of Taylor formula expansion-based Transformer, named TaylorFormer V2. This variant applies a novel attention mechanism, termed Taylor Expanded Multi-Head Self-Attention++ (T-MSA++), on the entire feature map across spatial dimensions. Specifically, T-MSA++ comprises two components: the first term involves the first-order Taylor expansion of Softmax-attention, offering an approximation of its numerical values; the second term represents an approximation to the first-order remainder of the Taylor expansion, enabling the attention function of T-MSA++ to exhibit non-linearity and thus focusing more on crucial regions. Furthermore, we leverage the associative law of matrix multiplication to reduce the computational complexity of self-attention from $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n)$. This approach offers three distinct advantages: 1) it preserves the capacity of Transformer to model long-range dependencies in data; 2) it delivers accurate approximations of values and more focused attention; 3) it directs the self-attention towards pixel-level interactions rather than channel-level ones, enabling more nuanced processing of features.

For the second challenge, MPViT [12] tackles the challenge by using multi-scale patches through parallel convolutional branches. However, we discover that its flexibility can be further improved. Taking inspiration from the success of DCN [13] and inception modules [14] in CNN-based restoration networks, we introduce a multi-branch encoder-decoder backbone into the current TaylorFormer V2, and form MB-TaylorFormer V2, which is built on a multi-scale patch embedding. This embedding offers diverse receptive field sizes, multi-level semantic information, and flexible receptive field shapes. Furthermore, as the computational complexity of the Transformer is quadratic with channel dimension, the design of multi-branch allows for the use of fewer channels to further reduce computational cost. The multi-scale patch embedding generates tokens with varying scales and dimensions. The tokens from different scales are then simultaneously fed into different branches and finally fused.

In summary, our primary contributions are as follows: (1) we use Taylor formula to perform a first-order Taylor expansion of Softmax-attention so that it satisfies the associative law of matrix multiplication, enabling the modeling of long-distance interactions between pixels with linear computational complexity; (2) based on the norm-preserving mapping, we approximate the higher-order terms of the Taylor expansion with linear computational complexity, which solves the unfocused attention problem of first-order expansion of Softmax-attention; (3) we devise a multi-branch architecture incorporating multi-scale patch embedding. This design, featuring multiple field sizes, a flexible shape of the receptive field, and multi-level semantic information, simultaneously processes tokens with different scales; (4) the experimental results of the image dehazing, deraining, desnowing, motion blurring and denoising tasks show that the proposed MB-TaylorFormer V2 achieves the state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance with less computational complexity and smaller number of parameters.

This work constitutes an extension of our conference

paper published in ICCV 2023 [15]. In comparison to our prior work, we have involved a significant amount of new content and additional experiments. (1) We deconstruct Softmax-attention using Taylor Expansion. Based on our research findings, we optimize the formula for T-MSA and redesign the network structure, introducing a more focused version referred to as T-MSA++. (2) Given that T-MSA++ effectively addresses the limitations of T-MSA in approximating high-order remainder of the Taylor expansion, we remove the Multi-scale Attention Refine (MSAR) structure and adopt the convolutional position encoding to provide positional information and increase the rank of the attention map. (3) We implement parallel computations across multiple branches, enabling higher inference speeds on hardware. This achievement prompts researchers to consider accelerating their own multi-branch structures using parallel processing techniques. (4) As shown in Fig. 1, we validate the generalization capabilities of MB-TaylorFormer V2 on a broader range of image restoration tasks.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 Image Restoration

In recent research, there has been a notable shift towards employing data-driven CNN architectures [16], [17] for image restoration, demonstrating their superior performance over traditional restoration methods [1]. Among various CNN designs, considerable attention has been directed towards encoder-decoder-based U-Net architectures [18] in the context of restoration. This preference is attributed to their hierarchical multi-scale representation, which proves effective in capturing intricate features while maintaining computational efficiency. Moreover, strategies involving attention mechanisms have emerged as a prominent avenue for image restoration, emphasizing the adaptive focus on different types of degraded regions [19]. The integration of generative adversarial networks (GANs) has also become increasingly popular, enabling the restoration of sharp image details with respect to the conventionally adopted metric of pixel-wise errors [20]. Some methods [21], [22] based on physical priors have also garnered attention. For instance, Dutta et al. [22] introduce a deep neural network called DIVA, which unfolds a baseline adaptive denoising algorithm (De-QuIP). This approach leverages the theory of quantum many-body physics and achieves SOTA performance across various image restoration tasks. Additionally, as a novel and effective deep learning architecture, Transformer is receiving widespread attention from researchers in the field of image restoration. Yang et al. [23] introduce the Transformer architecture in the task of image super-resolution, improving the detail information of the super-resolved images by reconstructing the self-attention relationships between high-resolution and low-resolution image texture details. Chen et al. [7] propose a Transformer-based universal image restoration method, effectively enhancing the performance by utilizing pre-trained IPT model weights and fine-tuning on specific tasks. More improved versions of Transformer [8], [9], [24] have been proposed. For a comprehensive overview of major design choices in image restoration, we recommend




Fig. 2: **Architecture of MB-TaylorFormer V2.** (a) MB-TaylorFormer V2 consists of the multi-branch hierarchical design based on multi-scale patch embedding. (b) Multi-scale patch embedding embeds coarse-to-fine patches. (c) T-MSA++ with linear computational complexity.

referring to reports from the NTIRE challenge [25], [26], [27] and recent literature reviews [28], [29].

2.2 Efficient Self-attention

The computational complexity of the Transformer increases quadratically with the growing spatial resolution of the feature map, placing a substantial demand on computational resources. Some approaches alleviate this burden by employing techniques, such as sliding window [30] or shifted window [9] based self-attention. However, these designs impose limitations on the ability of the Transformer to capture long-range dependencies in the data. MaxViT [31] addresses the decrease in the receptive field with Grid attention, yet Grid attention still exhibits quadratic complexity on high-resolution images.

Another strategy involves modifying the attention mechanism of the vanilla Transformer. Restormer [8] introduces self-attention between channels, but overlooks global interactions between pixels. Performer [32] achieves linear complexity through the random projection, but the queries, keys, and values necessitate a large size, resulting in increased computational cost. Poly-nl [33] establishes a connection between attention and high-order polynomials, yet this approach has not been explored in a self-attention structure. Other models [11], [34], [35] decompose the Softmax using kernel functions and leverage the associative law of matrix multiplication to achieve linear complexity. However, these models require constructing special kernel functions to approximate the functionality of Softmax-attention. e.g., [11] demands that each element of the

attention map is non-negative; [35] requires the attention map to exhibit local correlations; [34] necessitates more focused attention on relevant regions. Nonetheless, they all overlook numerical approximations.

2.3 Multi-scale Transformer Networks

In the field of high-level vision, in addition to simple pyramidal networks [36], IFormer [37] integrates inception structures for blending high and low-frequency information. However, it neglects the utilization of varied patch sizes. CrossViT [38] and MPViT [12] handle multi-scale patches through multiple branches, aiming to achieve diverse receptive fields. Nonetheless, the flexibility of the receptive field shape is constrained due to fixed-shape convolutional kernels. In the domain of low-level vision, MSP-Former [39] employs multi-scale projections to assist Transformers in capturing complex degraded environments. Giqe [40] employs a multi-branch approach to process feature maps of varying sizes. [41] employs multiple sub-networks to capture diverse features relevant to the task. GridFormer [42] designs a grid structure using a residual dense transformer block to capture multi-scale information. The recent Transformer networks designed for restoration tasks [8], [9] construct uncomplicated U-net architectures employing single-scale patches. Nevertheless, these endeavors scarcely delve into the exploration of multi-scale patches and multi-branch architectures. While [43] utilizes deformable convolution in self-attention, it is noteworthy that the number of sampling points in the convolution kernel remains fixed. In contrast, our multi-




Fig. 3: **Illustration of DSDCN.** The offsets are generated by $K \times K$ depthwise convolutions and pointwise convolutions, and the output is generated by $K \times K$ depthwise deformable convolutions and pointwise convolutions. D represents the number of channels of the feature maps.




Fig. 4: **Illustration of the receptive field of DSDCN (the offsets are truncated to $[-3,3]$).** The upper bound of the receptive field of the DSDCN is 9×9 and the lower bound is 1×1 .

scale deformable convolution not only boasts flexible sampling points but also offers multi-level semantic information.

3 METHOD

We aim to further explore the practicality of Transformer-based networks in image restoration tasks. To mitigate computational complexity, we employ Taylor expansion of Softmax-attention to use the associative law. Additionally, we present a technique for estimating the higher-order remainder of the Taylor expansion to focus on more crucial areas within the image. In the subsequent sections, we first present the architecture of MB-TaylorFormer V2 (Fig. 2(a)). Then, we introduce multi-scale patch embedding (Fig. 2(b)) and Taylor-expanded self-attention++ (Fig. 2(c))

3.1 Multi-branch Backbone

Given a degraded image $I \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times h \times w}$, we perform convolution for shallow feature extraction to generate $F_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times h \times w}$. Following this, a four-stage encoder-decoder network is employed for deep feature extraction. In each stage, a residual block is incorporated, comprising a multi-scale patch embedding and a multi-branch Transformer




Fig. 5: e^x (orange) and its first-order Taylor expansion curve (blue). The closer the value of x to 0, the tighter the approximation of the orange line to the blue line.

block, we replace the FFN layer in the Transformer with SKFF [8], which can adaptively select and fuse features from multiple kernel sizes, enabling the network to effectively capture multi-scale information. Utilizing multi-scale patch embedding, we generate tokens with various scales, which are then fed into multiple Transformer branches simultaneously. Each Transformer branch is composed of multiple Transformer encoders, and different branches perform parallel computations. At the end of the multi-branch Transformer block, we apply the SKFF module [44] to merge features generated by different branches, selectively fusing complementary features through an attention mechanism. Benefiting from this design, we can distribute the channel numbers across multiple branches. In general, the computational complexity of T-MSA++ increases quadratically with the growth of channel numbers, and the number of channels is much smaller than the number of tokens. Moreover, the divide-and-conquer approach of decomposing channels into multiple branches further reduces the overall computational cost. We utilize pixel-unshuffle and pixel-shuffle operations [45] in each stage for downsampling and upsampling features, respectively. Skip connections [46] are employed to integrate information from the encoder and decoder, and a 1×1 convolutional layer is used for dimensionality reduction (except for the first stage). A residual block is also applied after the encoder-decoder structure to refine the fine structural and textural details. Finally, a 3×3 convolutional layer is employed to reduce channel numbers and produce a residual image $R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times h \times w}$. The restored image is obtained as $I' = I + R$. To further reduce the computational cost, we incorporate depthwise separable convolutions [47] in the model.

3.2 Multi-scale Patch Embedding

Visual tokens exhibit considerable variation in scale. Previous approaches [8], [9], [24] commonly use convolutions with fixed kernels for patch embedding, potentially resulting in a single scale of visual tokens. To tackle this limitation, we introduce a novel multi-scale patch embedding with three key properties: 1) various sizes of the receptive field; 2) flexible shapes of the receptive field; 3) multi-level semantic information.

Specifically, we employ multiple DCN [13] layers with different scales of convolution kernels. This allows the patch embedding to generate visual tokens with varying coarseness and fineness, as well as facilitating flexible transformation modeling. Inspired by the concept of stacking conventional layers to expand receptive fields [48],




Fig. 6: **Principles of our mapping function.** (a) Before mapping: $Q=[0.2000, 0.9798]$, $K_1=[0.1000, 0.9950]$, $K_2=[0.9165, 0.4000]$, $K_3=[-0.9798, -0.2000]$, $K_4=[0.995, -0.1000]$. After mapping: $Q=[0.0083, 0.9999]$, $K_1=[0, 1]$, $K_2=[0.9966, 0.0828]$, $K_3=[0, 0]$, $K_4=[1, 0]$. (b) The values of the attention map represent the dot product of Q and K .

we stack several DCN layers with small kernels instead of using a single DCN layer with large ones. This approach not only increases network depth and provides multi-level semantic information, but also aids in reducing number of parameters and computational load. All DCN layers are followed by Hardswish [49] activation functions.

Similar to the approach used in depthwise separable convolutions [47], [50], we introduce a novel technique named depthwise separable and deformable convolutions (DSDCN). This method decomposes the components of DCN into depthwise convolution and pointwise convolution, as illustrated in Fig. 3. The computational costs for both standard DCN and DSDCN of an image with the resolution $h \times w$ are as follows:

$$\Omega(\text{DCN}) = 2DK^4hw + D^2K^2hw + 4DK^2hw, \quad (1)$$

$$\Omega(\text{DSDCN}) = 8DK^2hw + D^2hw, \quad (2)$$

where D is the number of channels of the feature maps, and K denotes the kernel size. Compared to DCN, DSDCN significantly reduces computational complexity.

Given that images usually exhibit local relevance, and patch embedding captures the fundamental elements of feature maps, the visual elements (i.e., tokens) should be more focused on local areas. To control the receptive field range of the patch embedding layer, we truncate the offsets, which are pragmatically chosen to be within the range $[-3, 3]$. As illustrated in Fig. 4, depending on the shape of the visual object, the model can autonomously select the receptive field size through learning. This selection process has an upper bound as 9×9 , equivalent to a dilated convolution [51] with a dilation factor of 4, and a lower bound as 1×1 . In the case of setting up multi-scale patch embedding in parallel, the sizes of the receptive field for different branches are $x_1 \in [1, 9]$, $x_2 \in [x_1, x_1 + 8]$ and $x_3 \in [x_2, x_2 + 8]$ in ascending order (for three branches). Experiments in Tab. 11 demonstrate that appropriately constraining the receptive field of each token can enhance the performance.

3.3 Taylor Expanded Multi-head Self-Attention

Let queries (Q), keys (K), and values (V) represent sequences of $h \times w$ feature vectors with dimensions D , respectively. The formula of the origin Transformer [52] is as follows:

$$V' = \text{Softmax} \left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{D}} \right) V. \quad (3)$$

Given that $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{hw \times D}$, $K \in \mathbb{R}^{hw \times D}$, and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{hw \times D}$, the application of Softmax results in a computational complexity for self-attention of $\mathcal{O}(h^2w^2)$, leading to high computational costs.

To reduce the computational complexity of self-attention from $\mathcal{O}(h^2w^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(hw)$, we initially express the generalized attention equation for Eq. 3 as follows:

$$V'_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N f(Q_i, K_j) V_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N f(Q_i, K_j)}, \quad (4)$$

where the matrix with i and j as subscript is the vector of the i -th and j -th row of matrix, respectively. $f(\cdot)$ denotes any mapping function. Eq. 4 turns to Eq. 3 when we let $f(Q_i, K_j) = \exp \left(\frac{Q_i K_j^T}{\sqrt{D}} \right)$. If we apply the Taylor formula to perform a first-order Taylor expansion on $\exp \left(\frac{Q_i K_j^T}{\sqrt{D}} \right)$ at 0, we can rewrite Eq. 4 as:

$$V'_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 + Q_i K_j^T + o \left(Q_i K_j^T \right) \right) V_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 + Q_i K_j^T + o \left(Q_i K_j^T \right) \right)}. \quad (5)$$

To approximate $\exp \left(\frac{Q_i K_j^T}{\sqrt{D}} \right)$ and ensure that the weights in the attention map remain consistently greater than 0, we normalize the magnitudes of Q_i and K_j to 1, generating \tilde{Q}_i and \tilde{K}_j . We obtain the expression for the Taylor expansion of self-attention as follows:

$$V'_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 + \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T + o \left(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T \right) \right) V_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 + \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T + o \left(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T \right) \right)}. \quad (6)$$

If we neglect the higher-order terms of the Taylor expansion, we can simplify Eq. 6 and leverage the associativity of matrix multiplication to reduce computational complexity, as shown below:

$$V'_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N V_j + \tilde{Q}_i \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{K}_j^T V_j}{N + \tilde{Q}_i \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{K}_j^T}. \quad (7)$$

However, ignoring the higher-order terms in the Taylor expansion of Softmax-attention typically sacrifices the non-linear characteristics of the attention map, reducing the attention capability of the model to some important regions in the image. In the next section, we introduce how we predict the remainder of Softmax-attention, ensuring that the attention map of T-MSA++ retains non-linear characteristics while maintaining linear computational complexity.

3.4 Focused Taylor Expansion Remainder

From the analysis of Fig. 5, it can be concluded that the remainder $o(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T)$ possesses two properties: 1) non-negativity; 2) offering a non-linear scaling of $\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T$ to provide more focused attention. Therefore, we have established a new mapping function as follows:

$$o(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T) = \phi_p(\tilde{Q}_i) \phi_p^T(\tilde{K}_j), \quad (8)$$

where $\phi_p(x) = \frac{\|\text{ReLU}(x)\|}{\|\text{ReLU}(x^p)\|} \text{ReLU}(x^p)$,

where x^p represents the element-wise power p of x . We adopt the ReLU function similar to previous linear attention modules to ensure the non-negativity of the input and the validity of the denominator in Eq. 8. A direct observation reveals that the norm of the feature is maintained after the mapping, i.e., $\|x\| = \|\phi_p(x)\|$, indicating that only the feature direction is adjusted.

Fig. 6(a) presents the principles of our mapping function. It diminishes the cosine distance between Q_i and K_j when they have a small initial distance, and conversely, increases the cosine distance between them when the initial distance is large. The distinctive properties of this mapping function enable T-MSA++ to assign more significant weights to Q_i and K_j vectors with the increased similarity in the attention map. Consequently, T-MSA++ achieves a closer approximation to Softmax-attention, as depicted in Fig. 6(b).

Obviously, through the mapping function, $o(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T)$ satisfies the following properties: 1) non-negativity; 2) when $p > 1$, for larger values of $\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T$, the following relationship exists:

$$\|\phi_p(Q_i) \phi_p^T(K_j)\| > \|Q_i K_j^T\|, \quad (9)$$

for smaller values of $\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_j^T$, the following relationship holds:

$$\|\phi_p(Q_i) \phi_p^T(K_j)\| < \|Q_i K_j^T\|. \quad (10)$$

To prevent the focused Taylor expansion reminder from excessively disrupting the numerical approximation of T-MSA++ to Softmax-attention, we introduce a learnable modulation factor 's' before $\phi_p(\tilde{Q}_i) \phi_p^T(\tilde{K}_j)$, which is

initialized to 0.5 and can be learned during the model training process. Furthermore, the following formula can be derived from Eq. 6 as

$$\begin{aligned} V'_i &= \sum_{j=1}^N f_1(Q_i, K_j) V_j + \sum_{j=1}^N f_r(Q_i, K_j) V_j \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N V_j + \tilde{Q}_i \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{K}_j^T V_j}{N + \tilde{Q}_i \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{K}_j^T + s \cdot \phi_p(\tilde{Q}_i) \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_p^T(\tilde{K}_j)} \\ &\quad + \frac{s \cdot \phi_p(\tilde{Q}_i) \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_p^T(\tilde{K}_j) V_j}{N + \tilde{Q}_i \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{K}_j^T + s \cdot \phi_p(\tilde{Q}_i) \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_p^T(\tilde{K}_j)} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Algorithm 1: Pseudo code of T-MSA++ in a PyTorch-like style.

```

1 input : A feature map  $I_f$  of shape  $b \times h \times w \times D$ 
2 output: A feature map  $O_f$  of shape  $b \times h \times w \times D$ 
3 #  $Q, K, V : b \times head \times hw \times \frac{c}{head}$ 
4  $Q, K, V = \text{rearrange}(\text{project}(I_f))$ 
5  $Q_1 = \text{normalize}(Q, \text{dim} = -1)$ 
6  $K_1 = \text{normalize}(K, \text{dim} = -1)$ 
7  $Q_h = \text{normalize}(\text{ReLU}(Q) ** \text{factor}, \text{dim} = -1)$ 
8  $K_h = \text{normalize}(\text{ReLU}(K) ** \text{factor}, \text{dim} = -1)$ 
9 # mm: matrix multiplication
10 #  $K^T : b \times head \times \frac{c}{head} \times hw$ 
11  $Q\_K\_V_1 = \text{mm}(Q_1, \text{mm}(K_1^T, V))$ 
12  $Q\_K\_V_h = \text{mm}(Q_h, \text{mm}(K_h^T, V))$ 
13 # Ones represents a matrix with all values equal to 1
14  $\text{Ones\_V}_h = \text{sum}(V, \text{dim} = -2). \text{unsqueeze}(2)$ 
15  $K\_Ones_1 = \text{sum}(K_1^T, \text{dim} = -2). \text{unsqueeze}(2)$ 
16  $Q\_K\_Ones_1 = \text{mm}(Q, K\_Ones_1)$ 
17  $K\_Ones_h = \text{sum}(K_h^T, \text{dim} = -2). \text{unsqueeze}(2)$ 
18  $Q\_K\_Ones_h = \text{mm}(Q, K\_Ones_h)$ 
19 #  $D, N : b \times head \times hw \times \frac{c}{head}$ 
20  $N = \text{Ones\_V}_h + Q\_K\_V_1 + Q\_K\_V_h$ 
21  $D = h \times w + Q\_K\_Ones_1 + Q\_K\_Ones_h + 1e^{-6}$ 
22 #  $O' : b \times h \times w \times c$ 
23  $O' = \text{rearrange}(\text{div}(N, D)) + \text{CPE}(V)$ 
24  $O_f = \text{project}(O')$ 

```

3.5 Convolutional Positional Encoding

The self-attention mechanism is agnostic to positions, although some positional encoding methods [10], [52] address this issue by incorporating positional information. However, these methods often require fixed windows or inputs. In T-MSA++, we employ a straightforward method called convolutional positional encoding (CPE). This method is a form of relative positional encoding that can be applied to input images of arbitrary resolutions. Specifically, for the input V , we utilize depthwise convolution (DWC) with multi-scale convolution kernels for performing grouped convolution, as shown below

$$V_I, V_{II}, \dots = \text{Split}(V), \quad (12)$$

$$\text{CPE}(V) = \text{Cat}(\text{DWC}_{3 \times 3}(V_I), \text{DWC}_{5 \times 5}(V_{II}), \dots). \quad (13)$$

We add it to the output V' obtained from the previous section. The last formula is as follows:

$$\text{T-MSA++}(Q, K, V) = V' + \text{CPE}(V). \quad (14)$$

The computational costs for both Softmax-attention and T-MSA++ in the context of an input feature with resolution $h \times w$ are as follows:

$$\Omega(\text{Softmax-attention}) = 2(hw)^2D + 4hwD^2, \quad (15)$$

$$\Omega(\text{T-MSA++}) = 8hwD^2 + 4K^2hwD, \quad (16)$$

where D is the number of input channels.

Algorithm 1 shows the pseudo-code for the matrix implementation of T-MSA++, which implements the efficient self-attention operations.

Rank of the attention map matrix. For general kernel models [11], there is a constraint on the rank of their attention maps given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rank}(\phi(Q)\phi^T(K)) &\leq \min(\text{Rank}(\phi(Q)), \text{Rank}(\phi^T(K))) \\ &\leq \min(hw, D), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where D is usually much smaller than hw , especially for image restoration, so it is challenging to achieve full rank.

On the contrary, the attention map of T-MSA++ is more likely to achieve full rank. For better illustration, we ignore the normalization effect of the denominator in T-MSA++. Since denominator normalization involves proportional scaling of all elements in each row of the attention map, it does not affect the rank of the attention map. The simplified formula for calculating the attention map of T-MSA++ is as follows

$$M_{att} = 1 + QK^T + \phi_p(Q)\phi_p^T(K) + M_{DWC}, \quad (18)$$

where M_{att} and M_{DWC} represent the simplified attention map of T-MSA++ and the sparse matrix corresponding to the DWC, respectively. Consequently, we can derive the following relationship

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rank}(M_{att}) &\leq \min(1 + \min(\text{Rank}(Q), \text{Rank}(K^T)) \\ &\quad + \min(\text{Rank}(\phi(Q)), \text{Rank}(\phi^T(K))) \\ &\quad + \text{Rank}(M_{DWC}), hw). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In theory, achieving full rank through the learning of parameters M_{DWC} is possible, enabling the attention map of T-MSA++ to have a higher rank. Consequently, in most cases, T-MSA++ exhibits richer feature representation.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Experiment Setup

We assess the effectiveness of the proposed MB-TaylorFormer V2 across benchmark datasets for five distinct image restoration tasks: (a) image dehazing (b) image deraining, (c) image desnowing, (d) image motion deblurring, and (f) image denoising.

Implementation Details. We present three variants of MB-TaylorFormer V2, namely MB-TaylorFormer-B V2 (the foundational model), MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 (a large variant), and MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 (an extra large

variant), the detailed structure is shown in Tab. 1. Data augmentation is performed through random cropping and flipping. The initial learning rate is set to 3e-4 and is systematically decreased to 1e-6 using cosine annealing [53]. The loss functions include L1 loss and FFT loss [54]. All compared methods are trained on the same training datasets and evaluated on the same testing datasets.

4.2 Image Dehazing Results

We progressively train our MB-TaylorFormer V2 with the same settings as [15] on synthetic datasets (ITS [63], OTS [63] and HAZE4K [68]) and real-world datasets (O-HAZE [89], Dense-Haze [64], and NH-HAZE [90]). The quantitative results in Tab. 2 and Fig. 1(a) highlight that our model significantly outperforms other models. Specifically, our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 achieves a 0.12dB and 0.77dB improvement in PSNR over the recent SOTA model ConIR-B [62] on the synthetic datasets ITS and Haze4K, respectively, while utilizing only 84.5% of the number of parameters of ConIR-B. On the outdoor synthetic dehazing dataset OTS, our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 achieves the second-best performance, significantly outperforming the subsequent methods C²PNet [61] and ConvIR-S [62]. Furthermore, for small-scale real-world datasets O-HAZE and NH-Haze, our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 achieves PSNR/SSIM gains of 0.07dB/0.012 and 0.11dB/0.014 over the previous best-performing model ConvIR, respectively. This indicates that MB-TaylorFormer V2 has strong capability and generalization for image dehazing. Compared to MB-TaylorFormer V1 [15], MB-TaylorFormer V2 with the same scale achieves improved performance, indicating that the proposed T-MSA++ is effective and focuses more on crucial regions. We also show the visual results of MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 in comparison to other SOTA dehazing models. As depicted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, the comparison highlights a stark difference between the shadows in images produced by counterpart models and those from our approach. Notably, the counterparts suffer from evident artifacts and texture degradation, resulting in less natural shadows. Conversely, our method yields dehazed images characterized by heightened clarity, enhanced cleanliness, and a remarkable resemblance to the ground truth.

4.3 Image Deraining Results

Following previous work [8], we train our model on 13,712 clean-rain image pairs collected from multiple datasets [16], [72], [73], [74], [75], [76]. With this single trained model, we conduct evaluations on various test sets, including Rain100H [70], Rain100L [70], Test100 [69], Test2800 [72], and Test1200 [16]. We calculate PSNR(dB)/SSIM scores using the Y channel within the YCbCr color space. The results in Tab. 4 highlight the consistent and comparable performance improvements achieved by our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 across all five datasets. In comparison to the recent SOTA model Restormer [8], MB-TaylorFormre-L V2 achieves optimal or suboptimal performance across all datasets. On specific datasets, such as Test1200 [16], the improvement can be as significant as 0.12dB, while utilizing only 62.5% of the MACs compared to Restormer.

TABLE 1: Detailed structural specification of three variants of our MB-TaylorFormer V2.

Model	Num. of Branches	Num. of Blocks	Num. of Channels	Params	MACs
MB-TaylorFormer-B V2	[2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]	[2, 3, 3, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2]	[24, 48, 72, 96, 72, 48, 24, 24]	2.63M	37.7G
MB-TaylorFormer-L V2	[2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2]	[4, 6, 6, 8, 6, 6, 4, 4]	[24, 48, 72, 96, 72, 48, 24, 24]	7.29M	86.0G
MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2	[2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2]	[4, 6, 6, 8, 6, 6, 4, 4]	[28, 56, 112, 160, 112, 56, 28, 28]	16.26M	141.9G

TABLE 2: Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on dehazing datasets. “-” indicates that the result is not available. The best and second best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models	SOTS-Indoor		SOTS-Outdoor		O-HAZE		Dense-Haze		NH-HAZE		Overhead	
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	Params↓	MACs↓
PFDN [55]	32.68	0.976	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.27M	51.5G
MSBDN [56]	33.67	0.985	33.48	0.982	24.36	0.749	15.13	0.555	17.97	0.659	31.35M	41.5G
FFA-Net [5]	36.39	0.989	33.57	0.984	22.12	0.770	15.70	0.549	18.13	0.647	4.46M	287.8G
AECR-Net [4]	37.17	0.990	-	-	-	-	15.80	0.466	-	-	2.61M	52.2G
MAXIM-2S [57]	38.11	0.991	34.19	0.985	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.10M	216.0G
HCD [58]	38.31	0.991	-	-	-	-	16.41	0.563	-	-	5.58M	104.0G
SGID-PFF [59]	38.52	0.991	30.20	0.975	20.96	0.741	12.49	0.517	-	-	13.87M	156.4G
Dehamer [60]	36.63	0.988	35.18	0.986	25.11	0.777	16.62	0.560	20.66	0.684	132.50M	60.3G
C ² PNet [61]	42.56	0.995	36.68	0.990	25.20	0.785	16.88	0.573	20.24	0.687	7.17M	461.0G
ConvIR-S [62]	41.53	<u>0.994</u>	37.95	0.990	25.25	0.784	17.45	<u>0.608</u>	20.65	0.692	5.53M	42.1G
ConvIR-B [62]	<u>42.72</u>	0.995	39.42	0.992	<u>25.36</u>	0.780	16.86	0.600	20.66	0.691	8.63M	71.2G
Ours-B V1 [15]	40.71	0.992	37.42	0.989	25.05	0.788	16.66	0.560	20.43	0.688	2.68M	<u>38.5G</u>
Ours-L V1 [15]	42.64	<u>0.994</u>	38.09	<u>0.991</u>	25.31	0.782	16.44	0.566	20.49	0.692	7.43M	88.1G
Ours-B V2	41.00	0.993	37.81	<u>0.991</u>	25.29	<u>0.790</u>	<u>16.95</u>	0.621	<u>20.73</u>	<u>0.703</u>	<u>2.63M</u>	37.7G
Ours-L V2	42.84	0.995	<u>39.25</u>	0.992	25.43	0.792	16.90	0.607	20.77	0.705	7.29M	86.0G




Fig. 7: Image dehazing on the images “00410” and “52_hazy” from SOTS [63] and Dense-Haze [64]. Our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 generates dehazed images with color fidelity and finer textures. “Ours V1” represents the conference version of our MB-TaylorFormer [15].

In addition, compared to MB-TaylorFormer-L V1 [15], the average PSNR has increased by 0.34dB, indicating the effectiveness of the proposed T-MSA++. The challenging visual examples are presented in Fig. 9 and Fig. 1(b), where MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 can generate raindrop-free images while preserving the underlying structural content.

4.4 Image Desnowing Results

We conduct desnowing experiments on a synthesis dataset. Specifically, we train and test on the Snow100K [80] and SRRS [81] dataset, respectively. We compare the performance of MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 with other methods and report the results in Tab. 5. On Snow100K dataset, MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 outperforms the previous best method,

ConvIR-B, by 0.09dB and exceeds the IRNeXt method by 0.4dB in terms of PSNR. On SRRS dataset, MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 outperforms the previous best method, ConvIR-B, by 0.16dB in terms of PSNR. Additionally, the number of parameters of our model is only 84.5% of that of ConvIR-B. Fig. 10 presents a visual comparison. Our approach effectively avoids artifacts and performs better in removing snow. This is attributed to the larger receptive field of the Transformer, which allows for long-range interactions to gather information from distant areas for image restoration. In contrast, convolutional methods have difficulties in handling degradation over large areas.



Fig. 8: Image dehazing on the images "443_0.56_1.04" from Haze4K [68]. Our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 generates dehazed images with fewer artifacts.




Fig. 9: Image deraining on the images "1" and "282" from Rain100H [70] and Test1200 [16]. Our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 generates rain-free images with structural fidelity and without artifacts.



Fig. 10: Image desnowing on the images "city_read_05583" from Snow100K [80]. Our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 generates cleaner snow-free images. "Ours V1" represents the conference version of our MB-TaylorFormer [15].

TABLE 3: Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on HAZE4K datasets. "-" indicates that the result is not available. The best and second best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models	Haze4K		Overhead	
	PSNR \uparrow	SSIM \uparrow	Params \downarrow	MACs \downarrow
MSBDN [56]	22.99	0.85	31.35M	41.5G
FFA-Net [5]	26.96	0.95	4.46M	287.8G
DMT-Net [65]	28.53	0.96	-	-
PMNet [66]	33.49	<u>0.98</u>	18.90M	81.1G
FSNet [67]	34.12	0.99	13.28M	110.5G
ConvIR-S [62]	33.36	0.99	<u>5.53M</u>	<u>42.1G</u>
ConvIR-B [62]	34.15	0.99	8.63M	71.2G
ConvIR-L [62]	<u>34.50</u>	0.99	14.83M	129.9G
Ours-L V1	34.47	0.99	7.43M	88.1G
Ours-L V2	34.92	0.99	7.29M	86.0G

4.5 Image Motion Deblurring Results

MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 is trained on the GoPro dataset [87] for the task of image motion deblurring.

Subsequently, the performance of MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 is assessed on two established datasets: GoPro and HIDE [88]. We compare MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 with the SOTA image motion deblurring models, including Restormer [8], NAFNet [96], and DiffIR [97]. The quantitative results, encompassing PSNR and SSIM metrics, are presented in Tab. 6. Notably, our MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 exhibits superior performance compared to other motion deblurring models. Specifically, on the GoPro dataset, which is regarded as a difficult dataset, MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 outperforms Restormer [8] and NAFNet [96] by 0.32dB and 0.21dB, respectively. Furthermore, when compared to DiffIR on both GoPro and HIDE datasets, MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 demonstrates improvements by 0.04dB and 0.11dB. These results underscore the efficacy of MB-TaylorFormer V2 in achieving SOTA motion deblurring performance. Furthermore, while MB-TaylorFormer-XL V1 achieves competitive PSNR values of 32.95dB on GoPro and 31.33dB on HIDE, our MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 demonstrates superior performance, surpassing MB-TaylorFormer-XL V1 [15] by 0.29dB on GoPro and 0.33dB on HIDE,

TABLE 4: **Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on deraining datasets.** “-” indicates that the result is not available. The best and second-best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models	Test100 [69]		Rain100H [70]		Rain100L [70]		Test2800 [71]		Test1200 [16]		Average	
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑
DerainNet [72]	22.77	0.810	14.92	0.592	27.03	0.884	24.31	0.861	23.38	0.835	22.48	0.796
SEMI [73]	22.35	0.788	16.56	0.486	25.03	0.842	24.43	0.782	26.05	0.822	22.88	0.744
DIDMDN [16]	22.56	0.818	17.35	0.524	25.23	0.741	28.13	0.867	29.65	0.901	24.58	0.770
UMRL [74]	24.41	0.829	26.01	0.832	29.18	0.923	29.97	0.905	30.55	0.910	28.02	0.880
RESCAN [75]	25.00	0.835	26.36	0.786	29.80	0.881	31.29	0.904	30.51	0.882	28.59	0.857
PreNet [76]	24.81	0.851	26.77	0.858	32.44	0.950	31.75	0.916	31.36	0.911	29.42	0.897
MSPFN [77]	27.50	0.876	28.66	0.860	32.40	0.933	32.82	0.930	32.39	0.916	30.75	0.903
MPRNet [78]	30.27	0.897	30.41	0.890	36.40	0.965	33.64	0.938	32.91	0.916	32.73	0.921
SPAIR [79]	30.35	0.909	30.95	0.892	36.93	0.969	33.34	0.936	33.04	<u>0.922</u>	32.91	0.926
Restormer [8]	32.00	0.923	<u>31.46</u>	<u>0.904</u>	<u>38.99</u>	<u>0.978</u>	<u>34.18</u>	<u>0.944</u>	<u>33.19</u>	0.926	<u>33.96</u>	0.935
Ours-L V1 [15]	31.48	<u>0.917</u>	31.28	0.903	38.60	0.980	34.00	0.942	32.93	0.917	33.66	<u>0.932</u>
Ours-L V2	<u>31.88</u>	0.923	31.57	0.909	39.03	0.980	34.20	0.946	33.31	0.919	34.00	0.935

TABLE 5: **Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on desnowing datasets.** “-” indicates that the result is not available. The best and second-best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models		DsnowNet [80]	JSTASR [81]	HDCW-Net [82]	SMGARN [83]	MSP-Former [84]	FocalNet [85]	IRNeXt [86]	ConvIR-B [62]	Ours-L V1 [15]	Ours-L V2
Snow100K	PSNR↑	30.50	23.12	31.54	31.92	33.43	33.53	33.61	<u>33.92</u>	33.79	34.01
	SSIM↑	0.94	0.86	0.95	0.93	0.96	<u>0.95</u>	<u>0.95</u>	0.96	<u>0.95</u>	0.96
SRRS	PSNR↑	20.38	25.82	27.78	29.14	30.76	31.34	31.91	<u>32.39</u>	32.26	32.55
	SSIM↑	0.84	0.89	0.92	0.94	<u>0.95</u>	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
overhead	#Param↓	15.6M	65M	6.99M	6.83M	2.83M	<u>3.74M</u>	5.46M	8.63M	7.43M	7.29M
	MACs↓	1.7K	-	9.8G	450.3G	<u>4.4G</u>	30.6G	42.1G	71.2G	88.1G	86.0G



Fig. 11: **Image motion deblurring comparison on the images “GOPR0410_11_00-000190” and “55fromGOPR1096.MP4” from GoPro [87] and HIDE [88].** Our MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 obtains sharper and visually-faithful results.

respectively. The qualitative results are shown in Fig. 11 and Fig. 1(c). It is worth noting that MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2 exhibits the highest visual quality, especially in restoring tiny text details with enhanced clarity. This qualitative assessment aligns with the quantitative research findings, further confirming the exceptional performance of our MB-TaylorFormer-XL V2.

4.6 Image Denoising Results

We conduct denoising experiments on a real-world dataset. Specifically, we train and test on the SID dataset [98]. Consistent with prior studies [8], denoising is executed using the bias-free MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 model, which allows for adaptation to a broad range of noise levels.

Tab. 7 shows the superior performance of our model. Particularly, on the SID dataset, our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 achieves noteworthy PSNR gains, surpassing the previous leading CNN model MPRNet [96] by 0.4dB. Additionally, compared to MB-TaylorFormer-L V1 [15], the PSNR gain of MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 reaches as high as 0.13dB. The visual results depicted in Fig. 12 show that our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 excels in producing clean images while preserving fine textures, indicating that compared to CNN methods, MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 can effectively utilize the low-pass characteristics of Transformers to filter out high-frequency noise. Additionally, compared to some Transformer methods, MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 can leverage its more precise global modeling capability to achieve




Fig. 12: Image denoising on the image “0003-0030” from SIDD dataset [98]. Our MB-TaylorFormer-L V2 generates noise-free images with structural fidelity and without artifacts.

TABLE 6: Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on deblurring datasets. “-” indicates that the result is not available. The best and second-best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models	GoPro [87]		HIDE [88]	
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	PSNR↑	SSIM↑
DeblurGAN-v2 [91]	29.55	0.934	26.61	0.875
SRN [92]	30.26	0.934	28.36	0.915
DBGAN [93]	31.10	0.942	28.94	0.915
MT-RNN [94]	31.15	0.945	29.15	0.918
DMPHN [95]	31.20	0.940	29.09	0.924
SPAIR [79]	32.06	0.953	30.29	0.931
MIMO-UNet+ [18]	32.45	0.957	29.99	0.930
IPT [7]	32.52	-	-	-
MPRNet [78]	32.66	0.959	30.96	0.939
Restormer [8]	32.92	<u>0.961</u>	31.22	0.942
NAFNet [96]	33.03	<u>0.961</u>	31.32	0.941
DiffIR [97]	33.20	0.963	<u>31.55</u>	0.947
ConIR-L [62]	33.28	0.963	30.92	0.937
Ours-XL V1 [15]	32.95	0.960	31.33	0.942
Ours-XL V2	<u>33.24</u>	0.963	31.66	<u>0.946</u>

better results. Fig. 1(d) demonstrates our advantage in computational cost.

4.7 Ablation Study

In this section, we conduct ablation experiments on the MB-TaylorFormer-B V2 model using the dehazing ITS [63] dataset to assess and understand the robustness and effectiveness of each module of the model.

Exploration of multi-scale patch embedding and multi-branch structures. In Tab. 8, we investigate variations in patch embedding and the impact of employing different numbers of branches. Our baseline model is a single-branch configuration based on standard single-scale convolution, as shown in Fig. 13(a). We then introduce modifications in the following ways. 1) *Multi-Branch Structure*: To assess the influence of a multi-branch structure, we design patch embedding models with a single-scale convolution and multi-branch parallel configuration (Conv-P), as shown in Fig. 13(b). 2) *Multiple Receptive Field Sizes*: To explore the effect of multiple receptive field sizes, we incorporate parallel dilated convolutional layers (DF=1, 2) for patch embedding (Dilated Conv-P), as shown in Fig. 13(c). 3) *Multi-Level Semantic Information Investigation*: To delve into the impact of multi-level semantic information, we replace dilated convolution with standard convolution for patch

embedding, employing a series connection between two convolutional layers (Conv-SP), as shown in Fig. 13(d). 4) *Flexible Receptive Field Shape Examination*: To assess the impact of flexible receptive field shapes, we substitute standard convolution with DSDCN (DSDCN-SP), as shown in Fig. 13(e). The experimental results indicate that the performance, ranked from the best to the worst, follows the order: DSDCN-SP, Conv-SP, Dilated Conv-P, Conv-P, and Conv. This suggests that our multi-scale patch embedding approach offers flexibility in patch representation.

Effectiveness of convolutional positional encoding. Tab. 9(a) demonstrates our convolutional positional encoding (CPE) module provides a favorable gain of 1.24dB over the counterpart without CPE module, with only a tiny increase in the number of parameters (0.05M) and MACs (0.45G), which is attributed to the fact that the CPE module provides a higher rank of the attention map [34] as well as the relative positional information of the tokens. In addition, Tab. 9(b) indicates that compared to our previously adopted MSAR module [15] used for providing local error correction and position encoding, CPE achieves a gain of 0.27dB in PSNR. This indicates that the T-MSA++ can efficiently approximate the higher-order cosine terms without the help of MSAR and that the CPE module is more suitable for T-MSA++.

Comparison with other linear self-attention modules. Tab. 9(c)-(i) presents a comparison between the proposed T-MSA++ and several common linear self-attention modules. The results indicate that TaylorFormer exhibits significant advantages over existing linear self-attention modules. This is attributed to several reasons: 1) T-MSA++ has a finer-grained self-attention capability compared to MDTA [8]; 2) our model excels at modeling long-distance pixels compared to Cswin [106] and Swin [10]; 3) the pooling mechanism in PVTv2 [105] leads to information loss; 4) LinFormer [107] relies on constructing a learnable low-rank matrix, which results in a high parameter count while limiting the rank of the attention map.

Analysis of the remainder of the Taylor expansion. To explore the remainder and its impact, we investigate the effect of different orders of Taylor expansion for Softmax-attention. Considering that the associative law is not applicable to the second-order Taylor expansion of T-MSA++ or T-MSA [15] (T-MSA-2nd), which leads to a significant computational burden, we perform first-order and second-order Taylor expansions for Swin. Tab. 10 shows that T-MSA-1st can approximate the performance of Softmax-attention, while higher-order Taylor expansions, such as T-MSA-2nd, can better approximate Softmax-

TABLE 7: **Quantitative comparisons of benchmark models on denoising datasets.** “-” indicates that the result is not available. The best and second-best results are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively.

Models		VDN [99]	SADNet [100]	DANet+ [101]	CycleSP [102]	MIRNet [44]	DeamNet [103]	MPRNet [78]	DAGL [104]	Uformer [9]	Restormer [8]	Ours-L V1 [15]	Ours-L V2
SIDD	PSNR↑	39.28	39.46	39.47	39.52	39.72	39.47	39.71	38.94	39.77	<u>40.02</u>	39.98	40.11
	SSIM↑	0.956	0.957	0.957	0.957	<u>0.959</u>	0.957	0.958	0.953	<u>0.959</u>	0.960	<u>0.959</u>	0.960
overhead	Params↓	7.81M	4.32M	9.15M	<u>2.83M</u>	31.8M	2.22M	11.3M	5.62M	20.63M	26.10M	7.43M	7.29M
	MACs↓	49.4G	<u>21.4G</u>	14.8G	335.0G	785.0G	145.8G	571.2G	22.8G	43.9G	141.0G	88.1G	86.0G




Fig. 13: The structure of patch embedding.

TABLE 8: **Ablation studies for the multi-scale patch embedding and multi-branch structure.** “-SP” means two convolutional layers simultaneously in series and parallel with the same kernel size of 3, and “-P” means two convolutional layers in parallel with the same kernel size of 3.

Branch	Type of Conv.	PSNR	SSIM	Params	MACs
Single	Conv	39.43	0.992	2.61M	32.8G
Double	Conv-P	39.87	0.991	2.60M	37.1G
	Dilated Conv-P	39.99	0.992	2.60M	37.1G
	Conv-SP	40.25	0.992	2.60M	37.1G
	DSDCN-SP	41.00	0.993	2.63M	37.7G

TABLE 9: **Ablation experiments for the self-attention.** We compare T-MSA++ with other linear self-attention modules and investigate the effect of CPE.

Models	PSNR	SSIM	Params	MACs
MB-TaylorFormer-B V2	41.00	0.993	2.63M	37.7G
(a) w/o CPE	39.76	0.991	2.58M	37.6G
(b) CPE → MSAR [15]	40.73	0.992	2.69M	38.5G
(c) T-MSA++ → MDTA [8]	38.57	0.991	2.58M	35.2G
(d) T-MSA++ → Swin [24]	36.59	0.988	2.52M	36.4G
(e) T-MSA++ → TAR [11]	36.74	0.987	2.52M	34.0G
(f) T-MSA++ → PVTv2 [105]	38.10	0.990	10.89M	38.6G
(g) T-MSA++ → Cswin [106]	38.19	0.987	3.30M	40.1G
(h) T-MSA++ → LinFormer [107]	36.12	0.983	48.70M	371.7G
(i) T-MSA++ → Flatten [34]	40.47	0.993	2.63M	36.7G

attention. However, the computational complexity of T-MSA-2nd increases quadratically with image resolution, so it is difficult to model long-range dependence in practical applications. Unlike the quadratic computational complexity of T-MSA-2nd, T-MSA++ is an algorithm with linear computational complexity. Fig. 14 visualizes the attention map of the first layer of the model. We observe that for the point on the front of the chair (green point), the points corresponding to the front of the chair in the attention

TABLE 10: **Study of the remainder.** The smaller approximation error for Softmax-attention of Swin [10], the better the performance.

Models	PSNR	SSIM
Swin [10]	36.59	0.988
Swin + T-MSA++(2nd) [15]	36.50	0.988
Swin + T-MSA++(1st) [15]	36.37	0.987

TABLE 11: **Analysis of the truncation range of offsets.** Local correlations of tokens can improve model performance.

Truncation range	PSNR	SSIM
w/o	40.13	0.991
[-2, 2]	40.88	0.992
[-3, 3]	41.00	0.993
[-4, 4]	40.53	0.992

map have higher weights, while for the points on the side of the chair (blue point), the corresponding points in the attention map have higher weights. This indicates that T-MSA++ can focus on more crucial regions. This indicates that T-MSA++ has acquired the ability of attention focus similar to Softmax-attention.

The truncation range of offsets. Tab. 11 shows the effect of different truncation ranges on the model. We find DSDCN with truncated offsets achieves better performance than DSDCN without truncated offsets. We attribute the improvement to the fact that the generated tokens in our approach focus more on local areas of the feature map. We further investigate the effect of different truncation ranges and finally choose [-3, 3] as the truncation range for MB-TaylorFormer V2.

The choose of focused factor ‘p’. The performance of our model is robust to variations in ‘p’. Specifically, when ‘p’ ranges from 3 to 8, the PSNR/SSIM does not change significantly (refer to Tab. 12). This indicates that the model is not sensitive to this hyper-parameter. The attention maps




Fig. 14: Attention maps from T-MSA and T-MSA++ for an image patch. The attention map is computed based on the queries corresponding to the blue and green points, and the keys corresponding to all points. Through the distribution of attention and colorbar, it is evident that T-MSA++ is capable of generating sharp attention, while attention of T-MSA is relatively smooth.

of the network first layer are shown in Fig. 15 and as ‘ p ’ increases, the attention of the model to key areas is significantly enhanced. This allows the model to accurately capture important features in the images, thereby improving overall performance. However, when ‘ p ’ exceeds a certain threshold, the enhancement effect of this attention tends to plateau and may cause over-focusing on local details while neglecting global information. Referring to Fig. 15, $p=4$ is a balanced choice, as it allows for smooth focusing on important regions. Therefore, for simplicity, we select $p=4$ for all models presented in the paper without additional tuning to ensure reliable performance while minimizing the need for extensive hyper-parameter optimization.

TABLE 12: Quantitative Comparison of different focused factor p . The model performs best when $p = 4$.

Focused factor p	3	4	5	8
PSNR (dB)	40.81	41.00	40.93	40.76
SSIM	0.992	0.993	0.993	0.992




Fig. 15: Visualization of attention maps in the first layer of the network with varying ‘ p ’ values. A larger p makes the model pay more attention to regions that are similar to the blue points.

5 CONCLUSION

In previous image restoration methods, there are issues with inaccurate approximations of the original Transformer and

the lack of flexibility in tokens. In this work, TaylorFormer V2 is proposed to overcome the shortcomings of existing Linear Transformers, including insufficient receptive field, inability to perform pixel self-attention, and the neglect of value approximations, so it achieves a closer approximation to the original Transformer. In addition, we introduce multi-scale patch embedding to enhance the flexibility of token scales. Additionally, as an improved version of MB-TaylorFormer, we enhance the approximation function for the remainder of the Taylor expansion and adopt a parallel strategy for multiple branches in TaylorFormer V2. This enables MB-TaylorFormer V2 to focus more on crucial areas of the image and improves the inference speed of the model. Experimental results demonstrate that MB-TaylorFormer V2 is a SOTA image restoration model in dehazing, deraining, motion deblurring, and denoising. In the future, we aim to further optimize hardware support for Taylorformer, making our model more hardware-friendly.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. He, J. Sun, and X. Tang, “Single image haze removal using dark channel prior,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 2341–2353, 2010.
- [2] W. Ren, S. Liu, H. Zhang, J. Pan, X. Cao, and M.-H. Yang, “Single image dehazing via multi-scale convolutional neural networks,” in *ECCV*. Springer, 2016, pp. 154–169.
- [3] Y. Qu, Y. Chen, J. Huang, and Y. Xie, “Enhanced pix2pix dehazing network,” in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 8160–8168.
- [4] 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 *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 10 551–10 560.
- [5] X. Qin, Z. Wang, Y. Bai, X. Xie, and H. Jia, “Ffa-net: Feature fusion attention network for single image dehazing,” in *AAAI*, vol. 34, no. 07, 2020, pp. 11 908–11 915.
- [6] 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,” *ICLR*, 2021.
- [7] 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 *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 12 299–12 310.
- [8] S. W. Zamir, A. Arora, S. Khan, M. Hayat, F. S. Khan, and M.-H. Yang, “Restormer: Efficient transformer for high-resolution image restoration,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 5728–5739.
- [9] 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.
- [10] 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 *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 10 012–10 022.
- [11] A. Katharopoulos, A. Vyas, N. Pappas, and F. Fleuret, “Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention,” in *ICML*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5156–5165.
- [12] Y. Lee, J. Kim, J. Willette, and S. J. Hwang, “Mpvit: Multi-path vision transformer for dense prediction,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 7287–7296.
- [13] J. Dai, H. Qi, Y. Xiong, Y. Li, G. Zhang, H. Hu, and Y. Wei, “Deformable convolutional networks,” in *ICCV*, 2017, pp. 764–773.
- [14] C. Szegedy, V. Vanhoucke, S. Ioffe, J. Shlens, and Z. Wojna, “Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision,” in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 2818–2826.
- [15] 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 *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 12 802–12 813.
- [16] H. Zhang and V. M. Patel, “Density-aware single image deraining using a multi-stream dense network,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 695–704.

- [17] Z. Jin, M. Z. Iqbal, D. Bobkov, W. Zou, X. Li, and E. Steinbach, "A flexible deep cnn framework for image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 1055–1068, 2019.
- [18] S.-J. Cho, S.-W. Ji, J.-P. Hong, S.-W. Jung, and S.-J. Ko, "Rethinking coarse-to-fine approach in single image deblurring," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 4641–4650.
- [19] K. Zhang, D. Li, W. Luo, and W. Ren, "Dual attention-inattention model for joint rain streak and raindrop removal," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 7608–7619, 2021.
- [20] K. Zhang, W. Luo, Y. Zhong, L. Ma, W. Liu, and H. Li, "Adversarial spatio-temporal learning for video deblurring," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 291–301, 2018.
- [21] 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 Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 7419–7431, 2021.
- [22] S. Dutta, A. Basarab, B. Georgeot, and D. Kouamé, "Diva: Deep unfolded network from quantum interactive patches for image restoration," *Pattern Recognition*, p. 110676, 2024.
- [23] F. Yang, H. Yang, J. Fu, H. Lu, and B. Guo, "Learning texture transformer network for image super-resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 5791–5800.
- [24] J. Liang, J. Cao, G. Sun, K. Zhang, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte, "Swinir: Image restoration using swin transformer," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 1833–1844.
- [25] A. Abuolaim, R. Timofte, and M. S. Brown, "Ntire 2021 challenge for defocus deblurring using dual-pixel images: Methods and results," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 578–587.
- [26] A. Ignatov and R. Timofte, "Ntire 2019 challenge on image enhancement: Methods and results," in *CVPR Workshops*, 2019, pp. 0–0.
- [27] S. Nah, S. Son, S. Lee, R. Timofte, and K. M. Lee, "Ntire 2021 challenge on image deblurring," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 149–165.
- [28] S. Anwar, S. Khan, and N. Barnes, "A deep journey into super-resolution: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 1–34, 2020.
- [29] C. Tian, L. Fei, W. Zheng, Y. Xu, W. Zuo, and C.-W. Lin, "Deep learning on image denoising: An overview," *Neural Networks*, vol. 131, pp. 251–275, 2020.
- [30] H. Hu, Z. Zhang, Z. Xie, and S. Lin, "Local relation networks for image recognition," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 3464–3473.
- [31] Z. Tu, H. Talebi, H. Zhang, F. Yang, P. Milanfar, A. Bovik, and Y. Li, "Maxvit: Multi-axis vision transformer," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 459–479.
- [32] K. Choromanski, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Dohan, X. Song, A. Gane, T. Sarlos, P. Hawkins, J. Davis, A. Mohiuddin, L. Kaiser *et al.*, "Rethinking attention with performers," 2021.
- [33] F. Babiloni, I. Marras, F. Kokkinos, J. Deng, G. Chrysos, and S. Zafeiriou, "Poly-nl: Linear complexity non-local layers with 3rd order polynomials," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 10518–10528.
- [34] D. Han, X. Pan, Y. Han, S. Song, and G. Huang, "Flatten transformer: Vision transformer using focused linear attention," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 5961–5971.
- [35] Z. Qin, W. Sun, H. Deng, D. Li, Y. Wei, B. Lv, J. Yan, L. Kong, and Y. Zhong, "cosformer: Rethinking softmax in attention," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [36] X. Zhang, T. Wang, J. Wang, G. Tang, and L. Zhao, "Pyramid channel-based feature attention network for image dehazing," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 197, p. 103003, 2020.
- [37] C. Si, W. Yu, P. Zhou, Y. Zhou, X. Wang, and S. Yan, "Inception transformer," *NIPS*, vol. 35, pp. 23495–23509, 2022.
- [38] C.-F. R. Chen, Q. Fan, and R. Panda, "Crossvit: Cross-attention multi-scale vision transformer for image classification," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 357–366.
- [39] Y. Yang, H. Zhang, X. Wu, and X. Liang, "Mstfdn: Multi-scale transformer fusion dehazing network," *Applied Intelligence*, pp. 1–12, 2022.
- [40] P. Shyam, K.-S. Kim, and K.-J. Yoon, "Giqe: Generic image quality enhancement via nth order iterative degradation," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 2077–2087.
- [41] D. Zhao, J. Li, H. Li, and L. Xu, "Complementary feature enhanced network with vision transformer for image dehazing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07100*, 2021.
- [42] T. Wang, K. Zhang, Z. Shao, W. Luo, B. Stenger, T. Lu, T.-K. Kim, W. Liu, and H. Li, "Gridformer: Residual dense transformer with grid structure for image restoration in adverse weather conditions," *IJCV*, 2023.
- [43] A. Kulkarni and S. Murala, "Aerial image dehazing with attentive deformable transformers," in *WACV*, 2023, pp. 6305–6314.
- [44] S. W. Zamir, A. Arora, S. Khan, M. Hayat, F. S. Khan, M.-H. Yang, and L. Shao, "Learning enriched features for real image restoration and enhancement," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 492–511.
- [45] W. Shi, J. Caballero, F. Huszár, J. Totz, A. P. Aitken, R. Bishop, D. Rueckert, and Z. Wang, "Real-time single image and video super-resolution using an efficient sub-pixel convolutional neural network," in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 1874–1883.
- [46] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," in *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [47] F. Chollet, "Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions," in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 1251–1258.
- [48] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [49] A. Howard, M. Sandler, G. Chu, L.-C. Chen, B. Chen, M. Tan, W. Wang, Y. Zhu, R. Pang, V. Vasudevan *et al.*, "Searching for mobilenetv3," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 1314–1324.
- [50] A. G. Howard, M. Zhu, B. Chen, D. Kalenichenko, W. Wang, T. Weyand, M. Andreetto, and H. Adam, "Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*, 2017.
- [51] F. Yu and V. Koltun, "Multi-scale context aggregation by dilated convolutions," in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [52] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *NIPS*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [53] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, "Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts," 2016.
- [54] J. Liu, H. Wu, Y. Xie, Y. Qu, and L. Ma, "Trident dehazing network," in *CVPR Workshops*, 2020, pp. 430–431.
- [55] J. Dong and J. Pan, "Physics-based feature dehazing networks," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 188–204.
- [56] H. Dong, J. Pan, L. Xiang, Z. Hu, X. Zhang, F. Wang, and M.-H. Yang, "Multi-scale boosted dehazing network with dense feature fusion," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 2157–2167.
- [57] Z. Tu, H. Talebi, H. Zhang, F. Yang, P. Milanfar, A. Bovik, and Y. Li, "Maxim: Multi-axis mlp for image processing," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 5769–5780.
- [58] T. Wang, G. Tao, W. Lu, K. Zhang, W. Luo, X. Zhang, and T. Lu, "Restoring vision in hazy weather with hierarchical contrastive learning," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 145, p. 109956, 2024.
- [59] H. Bai, J. Pan, X. Xiang, and J. Tang, "Self-guided image dehazing using progressive feature fusion," *TIP*, vol. 31, pp. 1217 – 1229, 2022.
- [60] C.-L. Guo, Q. Yan, S. Anwar, R. Cong, W. Ren, and C. Li, "Image dehazing transformer with transmission-aware 3d position embedding," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 5812–5820.
- [61] Y. Zheng, J. Zhan, S. He, J. Dong, and Y. Du, "Curricular contrastive regularization for physics-aware single image dehazing," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 5785–5794.
- [62] Y. Cui, W. Ren, X. Cao, and A. Knoll, "Revitalizing convolutional network for image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [63] B. Li, W. Ren, D. Fu, D. Tao, D. Feng, W. Zeng, and Z. Wang, "Benchmarking single-image dehazing and beyond," *TIP*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 492–505, 2019.
- [64] C. O. Ancuti, C. Ancuti, M. Sbert, and R. Timofte, "Dense-haze: A benchmark for image dehazing with dense-haze and haze-free images," in *ICIP*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1014–1018.
- [65] M.-T. Duong, S. Lee, and M.-C. Hong, "Dmt-net: deep multiple networks for low-light image enhancement based on retinex model," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 132147–132161, 2023.
- [66] T. Ye, Y. Zhang, M. Jiang, L. Chen, Y. Liu, S. Chen, and E. Chen, "Perceiving and modeling density for image dehazing," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 130–145.
- [67] Y. Cui, W. Ren, X. Cao, and A. Knoll, "Image restoration via frequency selection," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.

- [68] Y. Liu, L. Zhu, S. Pei, H. Fu, J. Qin, Q. Zhang, L. Wan, and W. Feng, "From synthetic to real: Image dehazing collaborating with unlabeled real data," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2021, pp. 50–58.
- [69] H. Zhang, V. Sindagi, and V. M. Patel, "Image de-raining using a conditional generative adversarial network," *IEEE transactions on circuits and systems for video technology*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 3943–3956, 2019.
- [70] W. Yang, R. T. Tan, J. Feng, J. Liu, Z. Guo, and S. Yan, "Deep joint rain detection and removal from a single image," in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 1357–1366.
- [71] X. Fu, J. Huang, D. Zeng, Y. Huang, X. Ding, and J. Paisley, "Removing rain from single images via a deep detail network," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 3855–3863.
- [72]
- [73] W. Wei, D. Meng, Q. Zhao, Z. Xu, and Y. Wu, "Semi-supervised transfer learning for image rain removal," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 3877–3886.
- [74] R. Yasarla and V. M. Patel, "Uncertainty guided multi-scale residual learning-using a cycle spinning cnn for single image de-raining," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 8405–8414.
- [75] X. Li, J. Wu, Z. Lin, H. Liu, and H. Zha, "Recurrent squeeze-and-excitation context aggregation net for single image deraining," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 254–269.
- [76] D. Ren, W. Zuo, Q. Hu, P. Zhu, and D. Meng, "Progressive image deraining networks: A better and simpler baseline," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 3937–3946.
- [77] K. Jiang, Z. Wang, P. Yi, C. Chen, B. Huang, Y. Luo, J. Ma, and J. Jiang, "Multi-scale progressive fusion network for single image deraining," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8346–8355.
- [78] S. W. Zamir, A. Arora, S. Khan, M. Hayat, F. S. Khan, M.-H. Yang, and S. Ling, "Multi-stage progressive image restoration," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 14 821–14 831.
- [79] K. Purohit, M. Suin, A. Rajagopalan, and V. N. Boddeti, "Spatially-adaptive image restoration using distortion-guided networks," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 2309–2319.
- [80] Y.-F. Liu, D.-W. Jaw, S.-C. Huang, and J.-N. Hwang, "Desnownet: Context-aware deep network for snow removal," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 3064–3073, 2018.
- [81] W.-T. Chen, H.-Y. Fang, J.-J. Ding, C.-C. Tsai, and S.-Y. Kuo, "Jstasr: Joint size and transparency-aware snow removal algorithm based on modified partial convolution and veiling effect removal," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXI 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 754–770.
- [82] W.-T. Chen, H.-Y. Fang, C.-L. Hsieh, C.-C. Tsai, I. Chen, J.-J. Ding, S.-Y. Kuo *et al.*, "All snow removed: Single image desnowing algorithm using hierarchical dual-tree complex wavelet representation and contradict channel loss," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 4196–4205.
- [83] B. Cheng, J. Li, Y. Chen, and T. Zeng, "Snow mask guided adaptive residual network for image snow removal," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 236, p. 103819, 2023.
- [84] S. Chen, T. Ye, Y. Liu, T. Liao, J. Jiang, E. Chen, and P. Chen, "Msp-former: Multi-scale projection transformer for single image desnowing," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [85] Y. Cui, W. Ren, X. Cao, and A. Knoll, "Focal network for image restoration," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 13 001–13 011.
- [86] Y. Cui, W. Ren, S. Yang, X. Cao, and A. Knoll, "Imnext: Rethinking convolutional network design for image restoration," in *International conference on machine learning*, 2023.
- [87] S. Nah, T. Hyun Kim, and K. Mu Lee, "Deep multi-scale convolutional neural network for dynamic scene deblurring," in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 3883–3891.
- [88] Z. Shen, W. Wang, X. Lu, J. Shen, H. Ling, T. Xu, and L. Shao, "Human-aware motion deblurring," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 5572–5581.
- [89] C. O. Ancuti, C. Ancuti, R. Timofte, and C. De Vleeschouwer, "O-haze: a dehazing benchmark with real hazy and haze-free outdoor images," in *CVPRW*, 2018, pp. 754–762.
- [90] C. O. Ancuti, C. Ancuti, F.-A. Vasluianu, and R. Timofte, "Ntire 2021 nonhomogeneous dehazing challenge report," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 627–646.
- [91] O. Kupyn, T. Martyniuk, J. Wu, and Z. Wang, "Deblurgan-v2: Deblurring (orders-of-magnitude) faster and better," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 8878–8887.
- [92] X. Tao, H. Gao, X. Shen, J. Wang, and J. Jia, "Scale-recurrent network for deep image deblurring," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 8174–8182.
- [93] K. Zhang, W. Luo, Y. Zhong, L. Ma, B. Stenger, W. Liu, and H. Li, "Deblurring by realistic blurring," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 2737–2746.
- [94] D. Park, D. U. Kang, J. Kim, and S. Y. Chun, "Multi-temporal recurrent neural networks for progressive non-uniform single image deblurring with incremental temporal training," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 327–343.
- [95] H. Zhang, Y. Dai, H. Li, and P. Koniusz, "Deep stacked hierarchical multi-patch network for image deblurring," in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 5978–5986.
- [96] L. Chen, X. Chu, X. Zhang, and J. Sun, "Simple baselines for image restoration," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 17–33.
- [97] B. Xia, Y. Zhang, S. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Wu, Y. Tian, W. Yang, and L. Van Gool, "Diffir: Efficient diffusion model for image restoration," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 13 095–13 105.
- [98] A. Abdelhamed, S. Lin, and M. S. Brown, "A high-quality denoising dataset for smartphone cameras," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 1692–1700.
- [99] Z. Yue, H. Yong, Q. Zhao, D. Meng, and L. Zhang, "Variational denoising network: Toward blind noise modeling and removal," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [100] M. Chang, Q. Li, H. Feng, and Z. Xu, "Spatial-adaptive network for single image denoising," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 171–187.
- [101] Z. Yue, Q. Zhao, L. Zhang, and D. Meng, "Dual adversarial network: Toward real-world noise removal and noise generation," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 41–58.
- [102] S. W. Zamir, A. Arora, S. Khan, M. Hayat, F. S. Khan, M.-H. Yang, and L. Shao, "Cycleisp: Real image restoration via improved data synthesis," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 2696–2705.
- [103] C. Ren, X. He, C. Wang, and Z. Zhao, "Adaptive consistency prior based deep network for image denoising," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 8596–8606.
- [104] C. Mou, J. Zhang, and Z. Wu, "Dynamic attentive graph learning for image restoration," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 4328–4337.
- [105] 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," *Computational Visual Media*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 415–424, 2022.
- [106] X. Dong, J. Bao, D. Chen, W. Zhang, N. Yu, L. Yuan, D. Chen, and B. Guo, "Cswin transformer: A general vision transformer backbone with cross-shaped windows," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 12 124–12 134.
- [107] S. Wang, B. Z. Li, M. Khabsa, H. Fang, and H. Ma, "Linformer: Self-attention with linear complexity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04768*, 2020.