

Leveraging Contrast Information for Efficient Document Shadow Removal

Yifan Liu^{1,2}, Jiancheng Huang², Na Liu¹, Mingfu Yan², Yi Huang², Shifeng Chen²✉

Southern University of Science and Technology¹

Shenzhen Institutes of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences²

{yf.liu2, shifeng.chen}@siat.ac.cn



Fig. 1: Three sets of document shadow images and their corresponding shadow-free results obtained using our method are presented. From left to right, each set includes the shadowed image, followed by the image processed with our method, with the three sets displayed sequentially. Our method is capable of handling document shadow images from various scenarios, while preserving the text, patterns, tonal details, and other features that are covered by shadows in the original images as much as possible.

Abstract—Document shadows are a major obstacle in the digitization process. Due to the dense information in text and patterns covered by shadows, document shadow removal requires specialized methods. Existing document shadow removal methods, although showing some progress, still rely on additional information such as shadow masks or lack generalization and effectiveness across different shadow scenarios. This often results in incomplete shadow removal or loss of original document content and tones. Moreover, these methods tend to underutilize the information present in the original shadowed document image. In this paper, we refocus our approach on the document images themselves, which inherently contain rich information. We propose an end-to-end document shadow removal method guided by contrast representation, following a coarse-to-fine refinement approach. By extracting document contrast information, we can effectively and quickly locate shadow shapes and positions without the need for additional masks. This information is then integrated into the refined shadow removal process, providing better guidance for network-based removal and feature fusion. Extensive qualitative and quantitative experiments show that our method achieves state-of-the-art performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Shadows often appear in photographs due to occlusions during the capturing process. This phenomenon is widespread in natural scenes. However, shadows often obscure or hide key information in images. As a result, numerous shadow removal methods [11], [12], [46], [54] have been developed specifically for natural scenes. Shadow removal is also an important research direction in low-level vision. With the

recent trend of document digitization, applications such as Optical Character Recognition (OCR) [1], [7], [9], [33], layout reconstruction [3], [28], [37], [47], and table recognition [24], [29], [41], [51] have become increasingly widespread. Document shadows, however, severely impact the recognition and reconstruction accuracy of these tasks, thus generating a growing demand for document-specific shadow removal. It is therefore necessary to design dedicated method for documents.

Unlike general shadow removal, documents have unique attributes, such as text, tables, and layout, where shadows often obscure high-density information areas. Therefore, designing shadow removal methods tailored to document-specific features is essential. In recent years, some methods [4], [25], [27], [49], [50] have been developed for document shadow removal, yet they often overlook internal information within document shadow images. Some methods [27], [50] attempt to extract more document features by using deeper networks and additional modules, while others [4], [12] introduce shadow masks to guide shadow removal. These approaches inevitably impose greater demands on network design, training, and datasets, yet they tend to neglect the guiding potential within the document shadows themselves. In this paper, we focus on leveraging internal information within documents to guide shadow removal without relying on external aids like masks.

Images often contain rich attributes, such as contrast, brightness, and texture. However, these attributes may not be fully utilized in practical applications, leading to inadequate




Fig. 2: (a) and (b) are the document images with shadows and the shadow-removed images obtained using our method, respectively. (c) shows the contrast map of the shadow image, while (d) is the contrast map adjusted by our network.

information extraction. In the task of document shadow removal, shadows possess unique properties that significantly differ from those of other image processing tasks. Firstly, the position of shadows is crucial for the effectiveness of shadow removal, as it directly impacts the readability of the document and the presentation of information. Additionally, shadows are inherently visual, meaning they exhibit distinct morphological features within the image. We find that by enhancing contrast, we can effectively highlight shadow regions, making their characteristics more pronounced without the need to create a separate dataset containing masks of shadow locations. This approach saves time and costs associated with data annotation while leveraging the natural visual characteristics of shadows to improve the performance of shadow removal methods. By adjusting the contrast, the difference between the dark parts of the shadow and the surrounding bright areas is amplified, providing clearer evidence for subsequent processing.

With contrast information, we can adopt a naive end-to-end model for shadow removal. Based on other low-level tasks [48], we know that diffusion-based restoration methods can produce much better details than end-to-end ones because they are generative, but they may produce significantly different results when inputting a severely degraded image. Therefore, based on the above considerations, we address both fidelity and detail generation requirements by employing a non-diffusion-based model as the foundation for the shadow

removal module. Subsequently, a diffusion model is utilized to supplement additional details, achieving high-fidelity and high-detail shadow removal performance.

Given our intention to fully leverage the abundant information inherent in document images while keeping the network architecture as simple as possible, we have tailored our design accordingly. We design a coarse-to-fine document shadow removal method and utilize the contrast features to act as the shadow-scale representation. We present some removal results of our method, as shown in Fig. 1. In summary, the main contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We design a document shadow removal method that fully leverages image contrast to capture the position and other information of shadows without relying on additional masks. This extracted contrast information guides the network to achieve better feature fusion and more effective shadow removal.
- We propose an end-to-end coarse-to-fine framework guided by contrast representation for document shadow removal. This design effectively preserves fidelity while generating high-quality detailed images.
- Extensive qualitative and quantitative experiments demonstrate that our proposed method achieves superior visual effects and competitive performance, reaching state-of-the-art.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Natural Image Shadow Removal

In recent years, with the continuous development of deep learning in low-level vision tasks [10], [15], [16], [36], [39], methods [5], [8], [18], [22], [30], [43], [53], [54] for natural shadow removal has emerged. In terms of training data requirements, some methods that do not rely on paired datasets emerge. Le *et al.* [22] use adversarial training constrained by a physical model to achieve shadow region recognition and removal. Mask-ShadowGAN [14] proposes an unsupervised shadow removal method based on CycleGAN [52]. DC-ShadowNet [18] guides the generator and discriminator by integrating shadow and non-shadow domain classifiers, focusing on the removal of hard and soft shadows. Algorithmically, many methods based on attention mechanisms [40] and diffusion models [13], [17], [34], [35] also appeared. For instance, DeS3 [19] combines adaptive attention and ViT [6] similarity loss to address the removal of hard shadows, soft shadows, and self-shadows, with particular emphasis on shadows with unclear boundaries. Li *et al.* [23] introduce an interactive shadow removal framework based on diffusion models, semantic segmentation, and multimodal large language models. Additionally, benchmarks for shadow removal, such as WSRD [38], expand the study of shadow formation models by enhancing interactivity and modifying surface representation, introducing the DNSR algorithm as a reference solution.

B. Document Image Shadow Removal

Document images have relatively concentrated elements, resulting in significant content differences and a smaller scope




Fig. 3: Overview of the proposed pipeline. The entire network is composed of three modules. Initially, the shadow image undergoes preliminary shadow removal through the base shadow removal module. Subsequently, the contrast map is refined via Contrast Representation Module (CR) to generate a contrast representation heatmap. Under this guidance, the fine shadow removal network performs more precise shadow elimination and detail restoration.

compared to everyday natural scene images. This has led to the development of shadow removal methods [2], [20], [21], [32], [42], [44] specifically for document images. ShadowFormer [11] proposes a Transformer-based network that employs a multi-scale channel attention framework to capture global information, leveraging non-shadow regions to assist in the recovery of shadow areas. Li *et al.* [25] introduced a large-scale real-world dataset SD7K and a frequency-aware shadow removal network FSENet, which decouples high-resolution images in the frequency domain to learn low-frequency details and high-frequency boundaries for shadow removal in high-resolution document images. DocRes [49] presents a universal model that utilizes a visual prompting method called DTSPrompt to guide the model in executing various restoration tasks, unifying five document image restoration tasks, including dewarping, shadow removal, appearance enhancement, deblurring, and binarization. Zhang *et al.* [50] introduced a color-aware background extraction network CBENet and a background-guided document image shadow removal network BGShadowNet. Although these methods are effective, most of the focus remains on network design aspects, while the inherent information contained in the documents is not fully utilized.

III. METHOD

This work proposes an efficient end-to-end coarse-to-fine framework guided by contrast representation document shadow. In the following, we first introduce the design for extracting shadow representation through contrast. Subsequently, we detail the structure of the shadow removal model guided by contrast representation.




Fig. 4: Overview of the proposed contrast representation module.

A. Contrast Representation

To achieve a reasonable representation of shadow without the need of the corresponding shadow mask, we heuristically propose starting from contrast analysis, as illustrated in the Fig. 2. The rationale lies in the fact that the shadowed and non-shadowed regions in a shadow image exhibit significant differences in contrast. Leveraging this distinction, we can generate a contrast heatmap c_h using straightforward traditional image processing techniques by adjusting the contrast levels (See Fig. 4). This can allow us to pinpoint the shadow positions, densities, and intensities in the absence of the shadow masks. However, different input images respond differently to contrast adjustments. To address this variability, we devised an adaptive approach: the contrast heatmap c_h produced by traditional methods is fed into an adjustment network to generate an adaptive contrast representation heatmap $c = a_\theta(c_h)$. As shown in Fig. 2, (c) and (d) represent the results before and after adjustment, respectively. And as depicted in Fig. 2, the contrast representation heatmap captures both the intensity of the shadow and provides a rough segmentation map of the shadowed regions. This contrast representation heatmap serves

as a reasonable and highly effective condition, guiding our model with Shadow-Scale-specific information.

B. Contrast Representation Guide for Shadow Removal

Some previous works [26] choose to train multiple models for separate initial image restoration and diffusion generation stages. This is because the base restoration network, using a non-generative model, provides excellent stability, ensuring that the same input does not result in significantly different outputs. On top of this, the use of a diffusion model can effectively generate more details, serving as the finishing touch. Inspired by this approach, we also apply a two-stage network to the document shadow removal task, while incorporating contrast representation guidance to achieve refined document shadow removal.

The entire network structure consists of a base shadow removal module and a refine removal network module. The former is responsible for removing the majority of shadows in document images, while the latter performs more detailed refinement on top of the former, addressing any remaining shadowed areas. The base shadow removal module is composed of U-Net blocks. Given an input, the output prediction from the base shadow removal module can be represented as:

$$\hat{x} = \phi_{\theta}(x), \quad (1)$$

Where ϕ_{θ} represents the base shadow removal module, and x and \hat{x} are the model input and output, respectively. The refine removal network uses a diffusion model, which adds noise to \hat{x} to obtain \hat{x}_t , completing the forward process. The forward and sampling processes are as follows:

$$q(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{\alpha_t}x_{t-1}, (1 - \alpha_t)\mathbf{I}) \quad (2)$$

$$p(x_{t-1} | x_t, x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}; \mu_t(x_t, x_0), \beta_t(x_t, x_0)\mathbf{I}) \quad (3)$$

Where μ and β represent the mean and variance, and α is a hyperparameter. Additionally, we use \hat{x} as the condition to complete the training and sampling processes. To better guide the model in shadow removal, we introduce contrast representation to more effectively guide the model in refined shadow removal.

We inject the contrast representation guidance through attention mechanisms. In the diffusion model, we insert cross-attention layers into the U-Net to integrate the contrast representation, which can be expressed as follows:

$$Q = W_Q^{(i)} \cdot \varphi_i(z_t), \quad K = W_K^{(i)} \cdot \tau_{\theta}(c), \quad V = W_V^{(i)} \cdot \tau_{\theta}(c) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d}}\right) \cdot V \quad (5)$$

Here, $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\tau(\cdot)$ represent the projection of matrices to an intermediate representation, c and z denote the contrast representation and the features from the U-Net layers, respectively, and i refers to the i -th layer. W_Q , W_K , and W_V are composed of convolutional and linear layers.

Unlike traditional two-stage methods, our network adopts an end-to-end training paradigm, which simplifies the overall training process. During training, both the basic shadow

removal module and the refined shadow elimination network module are optimized simultaneously. The total loss function for the network is defined as follows:

$$L_{base} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{x}_i)^2 \quad (6)$$

$$L_{refine} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{x}_{pred})^2 \quad (7)$$

$$Loss = L_{base} + L_{refine} \quad (8)$$

where y denotes the ground truth, \hat{x}_i represents the predictions from the basic shadow removal module, and \hat{x}_{pred} corresponds to the predictions from the diffusion model.

Compared to designing complex network architectures, we find that our network, guided by contrast representation, already achieves excellent performance while maintaining the advantage of being lightweight. Additionally, the introduction of contrast representation significantly reduces the dependency on dataset requirements. Specifically, our method does not require shadow masks but instead leverages contrast priors to locate shadow regions and estimate shadow intensity. This approach demonstrates outstanding shadow removal performance.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

Datasets. We use the SD7K dataset proposed by Li *et al.* [25] as the dataset for both training and testing our approach and other methods. SD7K is currently the largest publicly available dataset specifically designed for document shadow removal. The dataset contains paired high-resolution document images along with their corresponding shadow masks, which provide ground truth for training and evaluation. For the purpose of this work, we focus solely on the paired images from SD7K for training our method, without making use of the shadow masks during the training and inference process. The SD7K dataset is split into 6,479 paired samples for training and 760 samples for testing, and we adhere to the original dataset partitioning in our experiments to ensure consistency and comparability with previous works. This dataset provides a comprehensive benchmark for assessing the performance of document shadow removal methods in a controlled setting.

Evaluation metrics. For all experiments, we adhere to commonly used evaluation metrics in the field of document shadow removal. We utilize Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), Structural Similarity Index Measure (SSIM) [45], and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) to measure the difference between the model output and the ground truth. For PSNR and SSIM, higher values indicate better shadow removal performance, while for RMSE, a lower value signifies better results.



Fig. 5: Visual comparison examples with other state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods on the SD7K testset.

B. Implementation Details

We adopt U-Net [31] as the backbone to design our network. All experiments are conducted using the PyTorch framework. The network is optimized using the AdamW optimizer. The momentum parameters are set to (0.9, 0.999), and a weight decay of $1e-4$ is applied to help regularize the model and prevent overfitting. To minimize the difference between the predicted and ground truth images, we use Mean Squared Error (MSE) as the loss function. The learning rate is initialized at 0.0001. Our training is conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU. The entire network is trained in an end-to-end fashion, meaning that all layers are updated during the backpropagation process. The input images are resized to a resolution of 768x768, and we use a batch size of 2 to ensure efficient memory usage while maintaining stable gradient updates. To enhance the model’s robustness

| Method | Venue | PSNR \uparrow | SSIM \uparrow | RMSE \downarrow |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| ShadowDiffusion [12] | CVPR 2023 | 29.41 | 0.97 | 9.6887 |
| BMNet [54] | CVPR 2022 | 30.23 | 0.97 | 8.3082 |
| HomoFormer [46] | CVPR 2024 | 21.93 | 0.93 | 22.047 |
| Shadowformer [11] | - | 26.32 | 0.97 | 13.007 |
| BEDSR-Net [27] | CVPR 2020 | 17.27 | 0.89 | 40.126 |
| DocRes [49] | CVPR 2024 | 27.91 | 0.98 | 10.707 |
| DocShadow [25] | ICCV 2023 | 29.99 | 0.98 | 8.3799 |
| BGShadowNet [50] | CVPR 2023 | 28.04 | 0.97 | 10.846 |
| Ours | - | 32.10 | 0.98 | 6.7631 |

TABLE I: Comparison with other state-of-the-art methods. All metrics are computed at a resolution of 768x768.

and prevent overfitting, we incorporate data augmentation techniques, including random rotation and cropping. And the training process spans approximately 200K iterations.




Fig. 6: Using shadow images collected by ourselves for generalization testing by inferring with models trained using different methods on the SD7K dataset. It can be observed that our method achieves good visual results in terms of text preservation and shadow removal effectiveness.

C. Comparison with State-of-the-Art Methods

To validate the effectiveness of our method, we compare it with recent state-of-the-art (SOTA) works in document image shadow removal and natural scene shadow removal. For document image shadow removal, we select four SOTA methods: BGShadowNet [50], DocShadow [25], DocRes [49], and BEDSR-Net [27]. Additionally, we also compare with methods targeting natural scene shadow removal, including HomoFormer [46], ShadowDiffusion [12], BMNet [54], and Shadowformer [11]. We use the SD7K testset for evaluation. All metrics are computed on results with a resolution of 768x768. To ensure a fair comparison, we retrain all other SOTA methods on the SD7K dataset and select their best-performing models for comparison.

As shown in the Tab. I and Fig. 5, we compare our method with recent SOTA approaches. The results in Tab. I show that our method achieves the highest PSNR and SSIM values, while obtaining the lowest RMSE, indicating the best performance for shadow removal. As illustrated in Fig. 5, other methods struggle with various shadow scenarios, often leaving residual shadows or altering document content. In contrast, our approach effectively removes document shadows in the majority of cases, while preserving the original document content, tone, and other details. Compared with other state-of-the-art methods, our approach demonstrates superior visual performance.

D. Generalization.

An important evaluation criterion for the model is its generalization ability, specifically its capacity to handle images from scenarios outside the used dataset. Therefore, we conduct experiments to evaluate the model’s generalization. We collect real-world document shadow images without ground truth. Compared to the images in the dataset, these collected document images feature more varied angles, content, and lighting conditions. Additionally, considering the significant

| Model | PSNR \uparrow | SSIM \uparrow | RMSE \downarrow |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Ours w/o condition | 30.68 | 0.97 | 7.7686 |
| Ours w/ condition | 32.10 | 0.98 | 6.7631 |
| Ours w/o adjustment | 32.05 | 0.97 | 6.7987 |
| Ours w/ adjustment | 32.10 | 0.98 | 6.7631 |

TABLE II: The quantitative results of the ablation experiments. ”Condition” refers to the ablation experiment where contrast is integrated into the network. ”Adjustment” refers to the ablation experiment involving the adaptive adjustment of the contrast map.

differences between document images and other natural images, using NR methods to evaluate these document images does not accurately reflect their quality and shadow removal performance. Thus, we rely on human subjective visual perception as the evaluation criterion. We test all models trained on the SD7K training set, which perform well on the SD7K test set, and now we use them for generalization testing on out-of-dataset images, except for those methods (ShadowDiffusion and BMNet) that require shadow masks. As shown in the Fig. 6, we present examples of how different methods handle document shadow images outside the dataset. Our method continues to perform well in removing shadows from these document images. Furthermore, based on human visual scoring, our most removal results of document shadow images are considered to have the best shadow removal results. This demonstrates good generalization performance compared to other state-of-the-art methods we compare with.

E. Ablation Studies

As shown in the Tab. II and Fig. 7, we conducted experiments to validate the effectiveness of the proposed method. By using contrast as a condition, we guide the model to perform more accurate shadow removal. Therefore, we carried out ablation studies focusing on two aspects: the inclusion




Fig. 7: The left shows the input image, while the right visualizes the attention map obtained by using the contrast map of the image as a condition input.

of contrast as a condition and the method of incorporating contrast.

The effectiveness of the contrast condition. Since the contrast map is derived from the original shadow image, it more accurately reflects features such as the position, shape, and surrounding information of shadows in document images. By incorporating the contrast condition, our model can more effectively remove shadows. In the Fig. 7, we visualize the attention map with the contrast condition included. It can be observed that attention mechanisms enable the model to learn surrounding information in shadow regions, thereby aiding more effective shadow removal. Additionally, we conducted quantitative experiments. As shown in the Tab. II, we trained models with and without the contrast condition. The quantitative results demonstrate that incorporating the contrast condition achieves better performance in terms of evaluation metrics.

The effectiveness of the adaptive adjustment of the contrast map. When we use the contrast map of the image as a condition, it is important to consider the variations between different images, especially when there are significant lighting differences. When extracting contrast maps from images with varying lighting intensities, the resulting attention maps can differ drastically, leading to inconsistent guidance for the model’s subsequent shadow removal process. To address this, we incorporated an adaptive network to adjust for the discrepancies in contrast maps caused by varying lighting conditions. Tab. II demonstrates that our adaptive adjustment of attention is effective.

V. LIMITATIONS

Although our method effectively removes document shadows, there are still several limitations. On the hardware side,

our training and inference are heavily reliant on GPUs, with specific memory requirements, and real-time inference is not achievable. In terms of scenarios, while our method can handle a wide range of shadowed images, there are still cases where the tonal consistency between the shadow-removed regions and the rest is not perfectly maintained.

VI. CONCLUSION

We shift the focus back to the document images themselves. Since document shadow images inherently contain rich information, we find that by extracting the document’s contrast information, we can generate a contrast map, which serves as a more informative alternative to traditional shadow masks. This contrast map contains valuable details such as the shape, position, and surrounding features of the shadows. By leveraging the contrast map, we can guide the model to perform better feature fusion and shadow removal without the need for explicit shadow masks. Furthermore, we employ an efficient end-to-end coarse-to-fine framework by extracting a contrast-centric representation. This approach ultimately leads to effective document shadow removal. Through extensive qualitative and quantitative experiments, we demonstrate that our method achieves state-of-the-art performance while also exhibiting strong generalization ability.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jeonghun Baek, Geewook Kim, Junyeop Lee, Sungrae Park, Dongyoon Han, Sangdoon Yun, Seong Joon Oh, and Hwalsuk Lee. What is wrong with scene text recognition model comparisons? dataset and model analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4715–4723, 2019.
- [2] Steve Bako, Soheil Darabi, Eli Shechtman, Jue Wang, Kalyan Sunkavalli, and Pradeep Sen. Removing shadows from images of documents. In *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 173–183. Springer, 2016.
- [3] Galal M Binmakhshen and Sabri A Mahmoud. Document layout analysis: a comprehensive survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 52(6):1–36, 2019.
- [4] Xuhang Chen, Xiaodong Cun, Chi-Man Pun, and Shuqiang Wang. Shadocnet: Learning spatial-aware tokens in transformer for document shadow removal. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [5] Xiaodong Cun, Chi-Man Pun, and Cheng Shi. Towards ghost-free shadow removal via dual hierarchical aggregation network and shadow matting gan. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 10680–10687, 2020.
- [6] Alexey Dosovitskiy. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [7] Shancheng Fang, Hongtao Xie, Yuxin Wang, Zhendong Mao, and Yongdong Zhang. Read like humans: Autonomous, bidirectional and iterative language modeling for scene text recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7098–7107, 2021.
- [8] Lan Fu, Changqing Zhou, Qing Guo, Felix Juefei-Xu, Hongkai Yu, Wei Feng, Yang Liu, and Song Wang. Auto-exposure fusion for single-image shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10571–10580, 2021.
- [9] Masato Fujitake. Dtrocr: Decoder-only transformer for optical character recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 8025–8035, 2024.
- [10] Chunle Guo, Chongyi Li, Jichang Guo, Chen Change Loy, Junhui Hou, Sam Kwong, and Runmin Cong. Zero-reference deep curve estimation for low-light image enhancement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1780–1789, 2020.
- [11] Lanqing Guo, Siyu Huang, Ding Liu, Hao Cheng, and Bihan Wen. Shadowformer: Global context helps image shadow removal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01650*, 2023.

- [12] Lanqing Guo, Chong Wang, Wenhan Yang, Siyu Huang, Yufe Wang, Hanspeter Pfister, and Bihan Wen. Shadowdiffusion: When degradation prior meets diffusion model for shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14049–14058, 2023.
- [13] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NeurIPS*, pages 6840–6851, 2020.
- [14] Xiaowei Hu, Yitong Jiang, Chi-Wing Fu, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Mask-shadowgan: Learning to remove shadows from unpaired data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2472–2481, 2019.
- [15] Jiancheng Huang, Yifan Liu, and Shifeng Chen. Bootstrap diffusion model curve estimation for high resolution low-light image enhancement. In *Pacific Rim International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 67–80. Springer, 2023.
- [16] Yi Huang, Jiancheng Huang, Jianzhuang Liu, Mingfu Yan, Yu Dong, Jiayi Lyu, Chaoqi Chen, and Shifeng Chen. Wavedm: Wavelet-based diffusion models for image restoration. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2024.
- [17] Yi Huang, Jiancheng Huang, Yifan Liu, Mingfu Yan, Jiayi Lv, Jianzhuang Liu, Wei Xiong, He Zhang, Shifeng Chen, and Liangliang Cao. Diffusion model-based image editing: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17525*, 2024.
- [18] Yeying Jin, Aashish Sharma, and Robby T Tan. Dc-shadownet: Single-image hard and soft shadow removal using unsupervised domain-classifier guided network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5027–5036, 2021.
- [19] Yeying Jin, Wei Ye, Wenhan Yang, Yuan Yuan, and Robby T Tan. Des3: Adaptive attention-driven self and soft shadow removal using vit similarity. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 2634–2642, 2024.
- [20] Seungjun Jung, Muhammad Abul Hasan, and Changick Kim. Water-filling: An efficient algorithm for digitized document shadow removal. In *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 398–414. Springer, 2018.
- [21] Netanel Kliger, Sagi Katz, and Ayellet Tal. Document enhancement using visibility detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2374–2382, 2018.
- [22] Hieu Le and Dimitris Samaras. From shadow segmentation to shadow removal. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XI 16*, pages 264–281. Springer, 2020.
- [23] Chenghua Li, Bo Yang, Zhiqi Wu, Gao Chen, Yihan Yu, and Shengxiao Zhou. Shadow removal based on diffusion segmentation and super-resolution models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6045–6054, 2024.
- [24] Minghao Li, Lei Cui, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, Ming Zhou, and Zhoujun Li. Tablebank: Table benchmark for image-based table detection and recognition. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1918–1925, 2020.
- [25] Zinuo Li, Xuhan Chen, Chi-Man Pun, and Xiaodong Cun. High-resolution document shadow removal via a large-scale real-world dataset and a frequency-aware shadow erasing net. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 12415–12424. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] Xinqi Lin, Jingwen He, Ziyang Chen, Zhaoyang Lyu, Bo Dai, Fanghua Yu, Wanli Ouyang, Yu Qiao, and Chao Dong. Diffbir: Towards blind image restoration with generative diffusion prior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15070*, 2023.
- [27] Yun-Hsuan Lin, Wen-Chin Chen, and Yung-Yu Chuang. Bedsr-net: A deep shadow removal network from a single document image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12905–12914, 2020.
- [28] Akshay Gadi Patil, Omri Ben-Eliezer, Or Perel, and Hadar Averbuch-Elor. Read: Recursive autoencoders for document layout generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 544–545, 2020.
- [29] Devashish Prasad, Ayan Gadpal, Kshitij Kapadni, Manish Visave, and Kavita Sultanpure. Cascadetabnet: An approach for end to end table detection and structure recognition from image-based documents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 572–573, 2020.
- [30] Liangqiong Qu, Jiandong Tian, Shengfeng He, Yandong Tang, and Rynson WH Lau. Deshadownet: A multi-context embedding deep network for shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4067–4075, 2017.
- [31] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention—MICCAI 2015: 18th international conference, Munich, Germany, October 5-9, 2015, proceedings, part III 18*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015.
- [32] Vatsal Shah and Vineet Gandhi. An iterative approach for shadow removal in document images. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1892–1896. IEEE, 2018.
- [33] Baoguang Shi, Xiang Bai, and Cong Yao. An end-to-end trainable neural network for image-based sequence recognition and its application to scene text recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(11):2298–2304, 2016.
- [34] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. pages 2256–2265, 2015.
- [35] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. In *NeurIPS*, pages 11918–11930, 2019.
- [36] Jingwen Su, Boyan Xu, and Hujun Yin. A survey of deep learning approaches to image restoration. *Neurocomputing*, 487:46–65, 2022.
- [37] Zineng Tang, Ziyi Yang, Guoxin Zhang, Yuwei Fang, Yang Liu, Chengguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, Cha Zhang, and Mohit Bansal. Unifying vision, text, and layout for universal document processing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 19254–19264, 2023.
- [38] Florin-Alexandru Vasluianu, Tim Seizinger, and Radu Timofte. Wsr: A novel benchmark for high resolution image shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1826–1835, 2023.
- [39] Florin-Alexandru Vasluianu, Tim Seizinger, Zhuyun Zhou, Zongwei Wu, Cailian Chen, Radu Timofte, Wei Dong, Han Zhou, Yuqiong Tian, Jun Chen, et al. Ntire 2024 image shadow removal challenge report. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6547–6570, 2024.
- [40] A Vaswani. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [41] Jianqiang Wan, Sibao Song, Wenwen Yu, Yuliang Liu, Wenqing Cheng, Fei Huang, Xiang Bai, Cong Yao, and Zhibo Yang. Omniparser: A unified framework for text spotting key information extraction and table recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15641–15653, 2024.
- [42] Bingshu Wang and CL Philip Chen. An effective background estimation method for shadows removal of document images. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3611–3615. IEEE, 2019.
- [43] Jifeng Wang, Xiang Li, and Jian Yang. Stacked conditional generative adversarial networks for jointly learning shadow detection and shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1788–1797, 2018.
- [44] Jian-Ren Wang and Yung-Yu Chuang. Shadow removal of text document images by estimating local and global background colors. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1534–1538. IEEE, 2020.
- [45] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [46] Jie Xiao, Xueyang Fu, Yurui Zhu, Dong Li, Jie Huang, Kai Zhu, and Zheng-Jun Zha. Homoformer: Homogenized transformer for image shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 25617–25626, 2024.
- [47] Yiheng Xu, Minghao Li, Lei Cui, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. Layoutlm: Pre-training of text and layout for document image understanding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 1192–1200, 2020.
- [48] Fanghua Yu, Jinjin Gu, Zheyuan Li, Jinfan Hu, Xiangtao Kong, Xintao Wang, Jingwen He, Yu Qiao, and Chao Dong. Scaling up to excellence: Practicing model scaling for photo-realistic image restoration in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 25669–25680, 2024.
- [49] Jiabin Zhang, Dezhi Peng, Chongyu Liu, Peirong Zhang, and Lianwen Jin. Docres: A generalist model toward unifying document image restoration tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15654–15664, 2024.
- [50] Ling Zhang, Yinghao He, Qing Zhang, Zheng Liu, Xiaolong Zhang, and Chunxia Xiao. Document image shadow removal guided by color-aware

- background. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1818–1827, 2023.
- [51] Xu Zhong, Elaheh ShafieiBavani, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. Image-based table recognition: data, model, and evaluation. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 564–580. Springer, 2020.
- [52] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2223–2232, 2017.
- [53] Lei Zhu, Ke Xu, Zhanghan Ke, and Rynson WH Lau. Mitigating intensity bias in shadow detection via feature decomposition and reweighting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4702–4711, 2021.
- [54] Yurui Zhu, Jie Huang, Xueyang Fu, Feng Zhao, Qibin Sun, and Zheng-Jun Zha. Bijective mapping network for shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5627–5636, 2022.