

Reweighted Low-Rank Tensor Completion and its Applications in Video Recovery

Baburaj M., *Student Member, IEEE*, Sudhish N. George, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper focus on recovering multi-dimensional data called tensor from randomly corrupted incomplete observation. Inspired by reweighted l_1 norm minimization for sparsity enhancement, this paper proposes a reweighted singular value enhancement scheme to improve tensor low tubular rank in the tensor completion process. An efficient iterative decomposition scheme based on t-SVD is proposed which improves low-rank signal recovery significantly. The effectiveness of the proposed method is established by applying to video completion problem, and experimental results reveal that the algorithm outperforms its counterparts.

Index Terms—Low-rank Tensor Completion, Sparsity Enhancement, Reweighted Tensor Completion, Reweighted Nuclear Norm

I. INTRODUCTION

SIGNAL completion aims to recover the original signal from its incomplete observations. It is one among the key tasks in medical imaging, decoding problems, computer graphics, computer vision, image and video processing to support further stages of processing. Practical observations will be degraded arbitrarily with respect to signal position and magnitude. Noise contamination and occlusions turn practical image and video signals quite noisy and annoying even with recent advances. Extremely sensitive ambient conditions and capture settings like low lighting, high ISO setting or rapid capture rate generate random degradations. Despite these, certain regions of image or frame segments might be invisible for users due to scratches, occlusions or errors while data conversion/communication. Nowadays, regeneration of missing pixel values of an image or video with pixel as well as region missing is a hot topic of research. This has become inevitable with the prevalence of camera phones, web-cams, and cheap memory devices, which enable us to collect as well as store more data than ever before. Recently several approaches have been found based on the characteristics of the video and the nature of the missing samples.

However, image and video completion problem is inherently an ill-posed problem since it does not ensure a unique solution. In order to convert the problem, well-defined researchers typically achieve a solution such that the recovered data is statically or structurally consistent with original image in some sense. The majority of the natural images and videos inherently possess redundancy which can be utilized as a good prior. This paper focuses on class of images and videos with low intrinsic dimensionality or complexity. Although they are samples or signals in high dimensional space, they reside in a very low dimensional subspace [3], [7], [8], [12], [14] or have a very sparse representation with respect to some basis.

Multilinear structures mathematically referred as tensors [33], [41], [42] emerge naturally in many of the real problems involving videos, hyper-spectral images, multi-spectral images etc. Owing to significant temporal redundancy video conveys richer information about the scene than a static image does. However, as we move from a two-dimensional image to multidimensional video, demand for computational complexity appears to be the bottleneck. On the contrary, effectiveness of algorithm directly depends on how robust is the temporal redundancy capture. A common thread of development is to decompose into matrices and capture spatial redundancy along with temporal redundancy using standard linear algebra. However, the consequences are undesirable in many cases. Another perspective is to model problem in tensors and process signals by taking full advantage of the methods implemented in tensor algebra [10]. Therefore, a structure which can capture redundancy in an inbuilt manner will definitely ensure better results while meeting computational bottlenecks. Building upon this thread, this paper proposes a tensor based transformations to regenerate the original low rank video from a deteriorated version while preserving consistency. In brief, video completion considers in regenerating the low rank original video from a deteriorated version while maintaining consistency between original and observed data.

Image completion [12], [27], [32], [38] techniques are the major catalyst for the field of tensor completion. In an image completion, suppose $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ correspond to degraded and recovered versions of an image respectively. Reconstruction from limited sampling is modelled as,

$$\min_{\mathbf{X}} \quad rank(\mathbf{X}) \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}) \quad (1)$$

where, Ω denotes the index set of the reliable pixels and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ is the orthogonal projection onto the span of matrices with non-zero entries restricted to Ω . Low rank signal recovery broadly handles rebuilding from partial knowledge by regularizing rank. Though $rank(\cdot)$ of a matrix is well defined, rank minimization is an NP hard problem. Thus, we would run minimization with the best matching convex surrogate namely, Nuclear Norm (NN) [37]. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) [1] of matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are unitary matrices and $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix contain singular values of $\mathbf{X}$. Then nuclear norm is defined as,

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_* = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i, \quad rank(\mathbf{X}) = r, \quad \sigma = diag(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \quad (2)$$

where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the singular values of $\mathbf{X}$. Use of nuclear norm for optimization is favourable in two ways, first of all convexity seeks global minimum irrespective of initial conditions. Additionally, nuclear norm is proven to be the tightest convex surrogate of rank [14]. The above problem is called Low Rank Matrix Completion (LRMC) [1], [7], [9], [12], [31] and it is employed in image completion, video completion [12], medical image reconstruction [12] etc. However, low rank matrix completion method is not suitable for recovering multi-linear data because the matrix nuclear norm defined in Eq. (2) cannot simultaneously capture the spatial redundancy and temporal redundancy [11]. Nowadays, very large volume of multi-linear data called *tensors* is generated in the form of video, hyper-spectral images, multi-spectral images etc. Since matrix completion is not an efficient technique to process these signals, one method is to treat them as tensors and process signals by taking full advantage of the methods implemented in tensor algebra [10], [39]. Major challenge in this area is that rank of a multi-linear data is not well defined [40].

In summary, the low-rank tensor completion problem is defined as completing an observed tensor $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ from the available entries Ω ,

$$\min_{\mathcal{X}} \text{rank}(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) \quad (3)$$

where, $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ is the estimate of underlying low rank tensor. Detailed definition of projection operators $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ is described in the Section- II. The above low rank tensor completion model [4], [9], [34]–[36], [38] can be applied effectively to multi-linear data completion problems such as video completion, hyper-spectral image completion, medical image processing etc. In the next section, a brief review current state of art is presented.

A. Related Work

Non-local means method is one of the pioneering approach to estimate image pixel values [27] from similar intensity pixels. This was elaborated with the help of accelerated algorithm to include partially accessible videos [26]. Recovery was performed pixel-wise as weighted average of similar patches across spatial and temporal coordinates, with weight directly proportional to patch similarity. Slicing and processing of videos into patches centered around each pixel across spatial and temporal directions causes computational burden. Several effective spatial partial differential equation based image inpainting techniques exist in literature. *Marcelo et al.* [23] combined discretized 2D-laplacian and gradient vector along with interleaved diffusion technique for updating pixels in inpainting region. This was further broadened by *Bertalmio et al.* [22] to handle video frame by frame but temporal coherency was lesser compared to spatial smoothness. *Jia et al.* [21] extended this one step ahead by combining static background repairing and moving foreground repairing. Although, this sufficiently maintained spatial as well as temporal consistency, lighting and shadow remained unhandled.

Recovery techniques took a new direction by exploiting known properties of image in prior to regularize limited samples. Total Variation (TV) minimization method [24], [25]

is one of the most commonly used image regularization priors. But piece-wise smoothness criteria inclines to smooth out finer details. *Hui et al.* modelled patch based video completion as a jointly sparse and low rank matrix approximation problem by combining similar patches present across spatial and temporal coordinates. Although this was a different direction from conventional methods, factorization and processing in terms of matrices was computationally expensive.

Low rank factorization is our tool to unravel the structure of tensors as extensions of matrix SVD concepts. There has been considerable research in this direction and a number of frameworks along with algebra and rank definitions exist. One among the earlier and fundamental algebraic factorization is CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) [16], [19] factorization in which tensor is decomposed as finite sum of rank-1 tensors. Additionally, tensor rank was defined as the minimum number of rank-1 tensors for exact decomposition. Although this appears to be conceptually simpler, problem is heavily ill posed as we do not have access to rank in prior practically. On the other contrary, Tucker [17] decomposition is more like a higher order PCA, with a core tensor to measure interaction with components along with transformed matrices on each mode whereas it can also be approximated as sum of outer products of vectors similar to CP. But Tucker decomposition suffers from local minima due to non-convex optimization.

Third order tensor factorization techniques were studied by *Kilmer et al.* [10] and this was further elaborated by *Martin et al.* [5] in a recursive manner for general p -order tensor. Nevertheless, multiplying blocks of block circulant matrices is costly in terms of computational speed and memory. Encouraged from the principle of circulant matrix diagonalisation *Martin et al.* developed a straight forward solution for higher order tensor multiplication using Fast Fourier Transform (FFT). They proposed a new tensor-Singular Value Decomposition (t-SVD) based on Fourier transform and proposed the idea of tensor tubular rank.

Based on t-SVD and tensor tubal rank, *Zhang et al.* [9] proposed solution to the tensor completion problem Eq. (3) and demonstrated the video completion capabilities of it. *Hu et al.* [4] proposed a Twist Tensor Nuclear Norm (t-TNN) and used it for video completion. *Zhang et al.* [31] implemented novel methods for multi-linear data completion based on t-SVD through a tensor nuclear norm penalized algorithm for video completion from missing entries. *Cands et al.* [18] showed remarkable improvement on the sparse recovery or estimation of signals by minimizing a weighted l_1 norm. Inspired by reweighted l_1 [18] minimization for sparsity enhancement, *Peng et al.* implemented a reweighted low-rank matrix recovery [6] and the technique were successfully applied in different image restoration problems. However, this method might not yield satisfactory results in video restoration problems because it is based on matrix nuclear norm which cannot simultaneously capture the spatial and temporal redundancy.

Apart from these *Yang Xu et al.* [32] implemented a model to recover a low-rank tensor by simultaneously performing low-rank matrix factorizations to the all-mode matricizations of the underlying tensor. *Baburaj M. et al.* [29] implemented a

dictionary based model for missing sample recovery for signals in manifold. *Greeshma et al.* [30] implemented a technique for missing area reconstruction of cloud contaminated satellite images using KPCA based image modelling. Both these methods are dictionary based approaches which require prior information about the signal. The next section describes the motivation behind the proposed technique.

B. Motivation

The driving idea of Compressive Sensing (CS) [20] is to represent a signal with minimum number of non-zero components, leveraging storage space constraints as well as processing speed. Sparsity of a signal $\mathbf{x} = \{x_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the number of non-zero elements also referred as l_0 norm, defined by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = |\{i : x_i \neq 0\}|$. If a signal $\mathbf{x}$ is K sparse then we can represent as well as reconstruct the original signal from a reduced number of measurements m such that $m \ll n$. ie $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$. This is mathematically modelled as below,

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \quad (4)$$

Since minimization of l_0 norm is a non-convex problem, we would go for minimization of convex surrogate l_1 norm.

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \quad (5)$$

This was extensively studied by *Candes et al.* [18] and showed that the gap between l_1 and l_0 norm is the dependency in magnitude. Contribution of stronger components and weaker components differ in l_1 minimization while it is uniform for l_0 optimization. As an attempt to bridge this gap, *Candes et al.* [18] came up with an iterative solution by reweighting non-zero values inversely proportional to its magnitude. This ensured impressive results for sparsity enhancement of K sparse signals. Reweighted l_1 norm of $\mathbf{x} = \{x_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for appropriate weights $\mathbf{w} = \{w_i\} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is defined as, $\|\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i$ for $x_i \neq 0$, where $\odot$ stands for component wise product or Hadamard product.

Reconstruction of missing samples from a partially accessible matrix structure with low rank prior information can be modelled as,

$$\min_{\mathbf{X}} \text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathcal{P}_\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{P}_\Omega(\mathbf{M}) \quad (6)$$

If singular values of a matrix are represented in terms of a vector, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ matrix rank minimization translates to sparsity enhancement of singular value vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. In other words, rank of a matrix is the l_0 norm of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Although, matrix rank minimization is an NP-hard problem, convex solution is achieved with the help of l_1 norm, $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i$ is also referred as Nuclear Norm $\|\mathbf{X}\|_*$ in literature.

Motivated from reweighted l_1 minimization strategy for sparsity enhancement, *Peng et al.* [6] proposed reweighted nuclear norm minimization of low rank matrix recovery from erroneous samples. Reweighted Nuclear Norm strategy for $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ for appropriate weights $\mathbf{w} = \{w_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is defined as,

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{*w} = \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \sigma_i \quad \text{for } \sigma_i \neq 0 \quad (7)$$

where, r is the rank of the matrix.

This paper proposes a method which extends this concept further to the case of multidimensional low rank structures with the help of latest algebraic framework. Tensor completion from limited samples harnessing the low rank property is modelled as tensor multi-rank minimization. Inspired by the reweighted strategy for matrices, this paper proposes a reweighted multi-rank minimisation using t-SVD.

C. Organisation of paper

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section II discusses the existing approaches in the area of image and video restoration and highlights challenges in this direction. Section II introduces the basic theories and the notations used in the rest of the paper, where we define several algebraic structures. The proposed reweighted approach for low rank tensor recovery from significant missing samples is discussed in detail in section III. Extensive experimental analysis on images and videos are provided in section IV to verify the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. Finally, section V outlines the implications of this work and future directions.

II. PRELIMINARIES ON TENSOR AND NOTATIONS

This section introduces basics of tensor algebra and notations followed by this paper. This paper uses Euler script for denoting tensors e.g. $\mathcal{X}$, bold upper-case letters e.g. $\mathbf{M}$ for matrices, bold lower-case letters e.g. $\mathbf{v}$ for vectors and lower-case letters for scalars.

A tensor is a multi-linear structure [3], [5], [7] in $\mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_N}$. A vector is first order tensor, a matrix is second order tensor and multi-linear data of order three or above are called higher order tensors. A slice of a tensor in a 2D section defined by all but two indices [5]. The horizontal, lateral and frontal slices of third order tensor is shown in Figure 1. For a 3-way tensor $\mathcal{X}$, k^{th} horizontal, lateral and frontal slices are given by $\mathcal{X}(k, :, :)$, $\mathcal{X}(:, k, :)$ and $\mathcal{X}(:, :, k)$ respectively.




Figure 1: (a) Horizontal (b) Lateral (c) Frontal slices of a third order Tensor

A fiber of a tensor is a 1D section defined by fixing all indices but one. The mode-1, mode-2 and mode-3 fibers of a third order tensor is shown in the Figure 2. The fibers $\mathcal{X}(:, i, j)$, $\mathcal{X}(i, :, j)$ and $\mathcal{X}(i, j, :)$ denote mode-1, mode-2 and mode-3 fibers respectively.




Figure 2: (a) mode-1 fiber (b) mode-2 fiber (c) mode-3 fiber

$\mathcal{X}_f = \text{fft}(\mathcal{X}, [], 3)$ denote $\text{fft}(\cdot)$ along the third dimension. $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ denotes $\mathcal{X}(:, :, k)$ (frontal faces). Mode - l **unfolding** of $\mathcal{X}_{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \prod_{k \neq l} n_k}$ is a matrix whose columns are mode - l fibers. The opposite operations is called **fold** of the unfolding is defined as $\text{fold}_l(\mathcal{X}_{(l)}) = \mathcal{X}$. Frobenius norm of $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ is

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j,k} \mathcal{X}(i,j,k)^2} \quad (8)$$

and l_1 norm of $\mathcal{X}$ is

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_1 = \sum_{i,j,k} |\mathcal{X}(i,j,k)| \quad (9)$$

Tensor frame-work [5], [10] define basically five block based operations namely, $\text{bcirc}(\cdot)$, $\text{bvec}(\cdot)$, $\text{bvfold}(\cdot)$, $\text{bdiag}(\cdot)$ and $\text{bdfold}(\cdot)$ to construct product of tensors. For a $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ define five block-based operations are defined as,

$$\text{bcirc}(\mathcal{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^{(1)} & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} & \dots & \mathcal{X}^{(n_2)} \\ \mathcal{X}^{(2)} & \mathcal{X}^{(1)} & \dots & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3-1)} & \dots & \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{bvec}(\mathcal{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \\ \mathcal{X}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{bvfold}(\text{bvec}(\mathcal{X})) = \mathcal{X} \quad (11)$$

$$\text{bdiag}(\mathcal{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^{(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathcal{X}^{(n_3)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{bdfold}(\text{bdiag}(\mathcal{X})) = \mathcal{X} \quad (12)$$

Definition 1 (t-product). Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_4 \times n_3}$ then

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y} = \text{bvfold}(\text{bcirc}(\mathcal{X})\text{bvec}(\mathcal{Y})), \quad \mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_4 \times n_3} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(i, j, :) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} \mathcal{X}(i, k, :) \otimes \mathcal{Y}(k, j, :) \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_f^{(k)} = \mathcal{X}_f^{(k)} \mathcal{Y}_f^{(k)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_3 \quad (15)$$

Definition 2 (Tensor Transpose). Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ then the $\mathcal{X}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ obtained by transposing each frontal slice of $\mathcal{X}$ and then reversing the order of the transposed frontal slices 2 through n_3 .

Definition 3 (Identity Tensor). The identity tensor $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ is a tensor whose first frontal slices is an $n_1 \times n_1$ identity matrix and all other frontal slices are zero.

Definition 4 (Orthogonal Tensor). The tensor $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ is orthogonal if

$$\mathcal{Q}^T * \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q} * \mathcal{Q}^T = \mathcal{I} \quad (16)$$

Definition 5 (f-diagonal Tensor). The tensor is said to be f-diagonal if each of its frontal slices is diagonal matrix.

Definition 6 (Tensor Singular Value Decomposition t-SVD). Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ then t-SVD is given by,

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U} * \Sigma * \mathcal{V}^T \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are unitary tensors of size $n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3$ and $n_2 \times n_2 \times n_3$ respectively. Σ is f-diagonal tensor of size $n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3$. t-SVD can be calculated by computing matrix SVDs in the Fourier domain. The t-SVD is illustrated in Figure 3 and the algorithm is listed in Algorithm 1.

Definition 7 (Tensor Multi-rank). The multi-rank of $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{n_3}$ with i^{th} element equal to the rank of i^{th} frontal slice of $\mathcal{X}_f$.

Definition 8 (Tensor Nuclear Norm). The generalized nuclear norm of $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ is given by,

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\oplus} := \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} \sum_{i=1}^{\min(n_1, n_2)} |\Sigma_f(i, j, k)| \quad (18)$$




Figure 3: Tensor Singular Value Decomposition

In the following section the detailed discussion of proposed method is presented.

Algorithm 1: Tensor Singular Value Decomposition tSVD(.)

Input: tensor $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$

Output: Tensor $\mathcal{U}, \Sigma, \mathcal{V}$

```

1 for  $k = 1 : n_3$  do
2    $\mathcal{X}_f = \text{fft}(\mathcal{X}, [ ], 3)$ 
3    $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{V}] = \text{svd}(\mathcal{X}_f^{(k)})$ 
4    $\mathcal{U}_f = \mathbf{U}, \quad \mathcal{S}_f^{(k)} = \mathbf{S}, \quad \mathcal{V}_f^{(k)} = \mathbf{V}$ 
5 end
6  $\mathcal{U} = \text{ifft}(\mathcal{U}_f, [ ], 3), \mathcal{S} = \text{ifft}(\mathcal{S}_f, [ ], 3), \mathcal{V} = \text{ifft}(\mathcal{V}_f, [ ], 3)$ 
7 return  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}$ 

```

III. PROPOSED METHOD

Multi-dimensional signal completion task aims at predicting the missing entries of the incomplete observed data with meaningful samples utilizing any prior information about it. In the proposed method, the prior information is that multi-dimensional data or tensor is rank deficient. The tensor completion problem can be described as completing a low multi-rank tensor $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ from an incomplete observation $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ [4], [31]. In other words, the situation may be depicted as a low-rank multi-dimensional signal randomly corrupted by missing samples and it is required to recover it from the observed signal samples. Suppose a tensor of

incomplete observations $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ is given, then it can be completed by minimizing the tensor multi-rank,

$$\min_{\mathcal{L}} \text{rank}(\mathcal{L}) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{L}) \quad (19)$$

where, $\mathcal{L}$ is the low tubular-rank tensor and Ω is the set of observed samples. $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ is the orthogonal projector onto the span of tensors with non-zero entries restricted in Ω , defined as,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{X})(i, j, k) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(i, j, k) & \text{if } (i, j, k) \in \Omega \\ 0 & \text{if } (i, j, k) \notin \Omega \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

and its complementary projection is defined as,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^{\perp}}(\mathcal{X})(i, j, k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (i, j, k) \in \Omega \\ \mathcal{X}(i, j, k) & \text{if } (i, j, k) \notin \Omega \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

so that $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{X}) + \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^{\perp}}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$.

The $\text{rank}(\cdot)$ is non-convex and its best convex approximation is tensor nuclear norm. The above optimization problem can be rewritten as,

$$\min_{\mathcal{L}} \|\mathcal{L}\|_{\otimes} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{L}) \quad (22)$$

The above Tensor Completion (TC) problem can be solved by convex optimization [4], [31]. But the performance of above methods degrades considerably when the tensor become complicated or when too many error samples are present. To overcome this problem, this paper proposes a sparsity enhancement technique through reweighted norms. Recovery performance of the algorithm can be considerably improved with the new proposed method in terms of the quality of the recovery in worst case conditions.

A. Iterative Reweighted Tensor Completion

The rank of a matrix can be considered as the l_0 norm of the singular values of it. Suppose singular value decomposition of $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is given by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ and the $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X})$ is,

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) = \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_0 \quad (23)$$

where, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the singular value vector of $\mathbf{X}$. Similarly, the each component of multi-rank vector of a tensor can be considered as l_0 norm of each frontal faces of the given tensor. Therefore, rank minimization problem turns out to be l_0 minimization of singular values of the data. However, l_0 norm is non-convex and it is replaced by l_1 norm to apply standard convex optimization procedures. If we can apply appropriate non-uniform weighting on the singular values, a performance very near to the l_0 norm can be achieved and this is called sparsity enhancement [6], [18]. The sparsity enhanced version of the problem Eq. (22) is proposed in this section via reweighted technique.

Definition 9 (Weighted Tensor Nuclear Norm). Suppose a tensor $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ and let, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ be the weight tensor and let $\Sigma_f(i, j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ be the singular value tensor of $\mathcal{X}$ then the Weighted Tensor Nuclear Norm (WTNN) operator $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} : \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as,

$$\|\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} \sum_{i=1}^{\min(n_1, n_2)} \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(i, j, k) |\Sigma_f(i, j, k)|$$

Weighted nuclear norm signal recovery problem is stated as,

$$\min_{\mathcal{L}} \|\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} \quad \text{subjected to} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) \quad (25)$$

where, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the weight of the singular values of $\mathcal{L}$ and let $\Sigma_f(i, j, k)$ is the singular value tensor of $\mathcal{L}$. The above problem can be considered as weighted nuclear norm minimization. The problem is tractable if it can be re-written as a standard optimization problem as

$$\min_{\mathcal{L}} \|\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} \quad \text{subjected to} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) \quad \& \quad \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{Y} \quad (26)$$

where, $\mathcal{Y}$ is an appropriate auxiliary variable. Inexact Augmented Lagrangian function for problem Eq. (26) can be written as [2],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\rho}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Y}, \Lambda) &= \|\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} + \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Y}=\mathcal{M}_{\Omega}} + \langle \Lambda, \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{Y} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{Y}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where Λ is the Lagrangian multiplier and $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. Problem (27) can be divided into two sub-problems and solved iteratively through two updates [2] as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} &= \arg \min_{\mathcal{L}^{(k)}} \left\| \mathcal{L}^{(k)}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \right\|_{\mathcal{W}_{\otimes}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathcal{L}^{(k)} - \left(\mathcal{Y}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \Lambda^{(k)} \right) \right\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Algorithm 2: Reweighted low-rank Tensor Completion

Input: Observed Data $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$

Output: Low-rank Tensor $\mathcal{L}$

```

1  $\mathcal{L}, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ 
2  $\mathcal{L}^{(0)} = 0, \mathcal{Y}^{(0)} = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}), \Lambda = 0, \rho^{(0)} > 0, \epsilon > 0, \eta > 0$ 
3 converged = false
4 while not converged do
5    $\mathcal{Z}^{(k)} = \mathcal{Y}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{\rho^{(k)}} \Lambda^{(k)}$ 
6    $[\mathcal{U}^{(k)}, \Sigma^{(k)}, \mathcal{V}^{(k)}] = \text{tSVD}(\mathcal{Z}^{(k)})$ 
7    $\Sigma_{\mathcal{W}}^{(k+1)} = \Sigma^{(k)} \odot \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}$ 
8    $\mathcal{Z}^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{U}^{(k)} \Sigma_{\mathcal{W}}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{V}^{(k)T}$ 
9    $\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{D}_{\frac{1}{\rho^{(k)}}}[\mathcal{Z}^{(k+1)}]$ 
10   $\mathcal{Y}^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^{\perp}}\left(\mathcal{L}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{\rho^{(k)}} \Lambda^{(k)}\right)$ 
11   $\Lambda^{(k+1)} = \Lambda^{(k)} + \rho^{(k)}(\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} - \mathcal{Y}^{(k+1)})$ 
12   $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(k+1)}(i, j, k) = \frac{1}{\Sigma_f^{(k)}(i, j, k) + \epsilon}$ 
13   $\rho^{(k+1)} = \eta \rho^{(k)}$ 
14  if  $\frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} - \mathcal{L}^{(k)}\|_F}{\|\mathcal{M}\|_F} \leq \text{threshold}$  then
15    | converged = true
16  end
17 end
18 return  $\mathcal{L}$ 
```

$$\mathcal{Y}^{(k+1)} = \arg \min_{\mathcal{Y}^{(k)}} \left\| \mathcal{Y}^{(k)} - \left(\mathcal{L}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \Lambda^{(k)} \right) \right\|_F^2 \quad (29)$$

$$\Lambda^{(k+1)} = \Lambda^{(k)} + \rho(\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} - \mathcal{Y}^{(k+1)}) \quad (30)$$

Eq. (28) can be solved by Tensor Singular Value Thresholding [11], [31] using t-SVD,

$$\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} = \mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{\rho}} \left[\mathcal{Y}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \Lambda^{(k)} \right] \quad (31)$$

where, $\mathfrak{D}(\cdot)$ is the singular value threshold operator. Eq. (29) has closed form solution [4], [31]

$$\mathcal{Y}^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{P}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^{\perp}} \left(\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \Lambda^{(k)} \right) \quad (32)$$

B. Re-weighting of Singular Values

Before applying singular value thresholding operation, singular values of the tensor must be reweighted to enhance sparsity. Let the t-SVD of $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ be $[\mathcal{U}, \Sigma, \mathcal{V}] = \text{tSVD}(\mathcal{L})$ (See Algorithm - 1). Reweighting operation can be defined as,

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{W}} = \Sigma \odot \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (33)$$

where, $\odot$ stands for component wise product or Hadamard product. The new tensor recalculated is $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{U} \Sigma_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{V}^T$ and it undergoes a Singular Value Thresholding (SVT) operation as defined in the next section.

C. Tensor Singular Value Thresholding

Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1 \times n_3}$ be a tensor and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U} * \Sigma * \mathcal{V}^T$ be singular value decomposition of $\mathcal{X}$ then the Singular Value Thresholding operator $\mathfrak{D}(\cdot)$ is defined as,

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\tau}[\mathcal{X}] = \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\Sigma) * \mathcal{V}^T \quad (34)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\Sigma) = \Sigma * \mathcal{J}$$

where, $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U} * \Sigma * \mathcal{V}^T$ is the t-SVD of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ is an $n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3$ f -diagonal tensor whose diagonal element in the Fourier domain is,

$$\mathcal{J}_f = \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{\Sigma_f} \right)_+ \quad (35)$$

where, Σ_f is the singular values of the tensor $\mathcal{X}$ in Fourier domain.

D. Weight Updating

The weights $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is updated after each iteration in such a way that the sparsity is improved after each iteration. In such an updating scheme, the new entries of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is inversely proportional to singular values of low-rank tensor component. Now the weight updated for $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is given by,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}(i, j, k) = \frac{1}{\Sigma_f(i, j, k) + \epsilon}, \quad \epsilon > 0 \quad (36)$$

The ϵ can be selected as value less than 1 and it cannot be too small or too large. A better choice for ϵ is non-linear function of percentage of missing samples as $\epsilon = e^{\alpha \frac{|\Omega|}{|\mathcal{M}|}}$ where, α is an appropriate positive scalar constant with values less than unity. This selection brings some sort of adaptiveness on the value of ϵ which results in better recovery as illustrated in the next section. The complete algorithm is given in Algorithm 2.

The objective function $\mathfrak{L}_{\rho}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Y}, \Lambda)$ in Eq. (27) is not a convex optimization problem because of non-uniform weighting operation. Therefore, the convergence of the above algorithm is still under investigation. But the numerical simulation and video restoration experiments give empirical proof on the performance of the algorithm. The experimental validation of the proposed algorithm on video restoration problem is described in the next section.

IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The proposed method is applied to video completion problem to evaluate its performance. The experimental verification of the proposed method is performed with standard QCIF test videos, such as Bus, Container, Hall, Highway, Soccer etc. [28] having dynamic content in various extends. The parameters are selected as $\rho^0 = 0.005$, $\eta = 1.5$, $\epsilon_{\text{epsilon}} = e^{0.02 \frac{|\mathcal{M}|}{|\Omega|}}$ and ten iterations are performed. Inverse relative error in $\mathcal{L}$ as $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ in dB and Average Structural Similarity Index over frames (ASSIM) are chosen as performance evaluation parameters. The inverse Relative Error in $\mathcal{L}$ is given by,

$$iRSE(\mathcal{L}) = -20 \log \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{L} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F}{\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F} \right) \quad (37)$$

where, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is the ground truth video and $\mathcal{L}$ is the recovered video. Maximum value of the tensor tubular rank is taken as *rank* of the tensor. Random corruption on the given tensor is generated via three way Gaussian random sampling and these samples are set to zero. The number of missing entries is varied from 20% to 90% and rank is varied from 20 to 50 in our experiment. Comparison of proposed method with the three different tensor completion techniques, GTNN [31], TMAC [32] and TC [9] is presented. The detailed listing of $iRSE$ by varying rank and percentage of unavailable samples are presented in Table: A and Table: B. ASSIM for different values of rank and percentage of unavailable samples are presented in Table: C and Table: D. The $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various values of unavailable samples are plotted in Figure: 4, Figure: 5 and Figure: 6 for ranks 20, 30 and 40 respectively. The recovery performance $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ over the data set is shown in the Figure: 7 and Figure: 8. The Figure: 9, Figure: 10 and Figure: 11 show the variation of ASSIM over various values of unavailable data for different ranks. The ASSIM over dataset is shown in Figure: 12 and Figure: 13. Some of the recovered frames are shown in the Figure: 14, Figure: 15, Figure: 17, Figure: 16 and Figure: 18.

The Table: A and Table: B shows that the inverse relative error in $\mathcal{L}$ degrades as the percentage of missing samples increases. With 20% missing samples, recovery performance of the proposed for the soccer video is 59.11dB and it falls to 9.48dB with 90% missing samples. Other techniques can only attain 48.53dB (TC) and 5.39dB (TMAC) with 20% and 90% missing samples respectively. This is the case for all other videos with varying ranks. Notice that as the rank of signal increases the recovery performance degrades. The recovery performance bus video for the proposed method with rank equal to 20 is 60.31dB; whereas it is 34.98dB when the rank

$$iRSE(\mathcal{L}) = -20\log\left(\frac{\|\mathcal{L}-\hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F}{\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F}\right) \text{ in dB}$$

Dataset	Rank	Percentage Missing (%)															
		20%				30%				40%				50%			
		GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed
soccer	20	25.91	22.56	48.53	59.11	24.34	22.04	37.20	45.89	21.25	21.43	30.37	36.32	21.55	20.65	25.15	29.97
highway	20	34.93	31.66	45.55	48.09	33.80	32.18	40.97	43.18	29.37	31.13	36.96	38.65	29.02	28.32	34.32	35.52
hall	20	33.59	31.21	44.12	45.24	32.90	30.66	40.33	41.34	29.18	29.83	36.91	38.02	28.33	27.56	33.90	35.15
container	20	33.06	29.75	46.64	49.70	30.57	29.21	40.75	43.47	27.21	28.08	36.01	38.49	26.76	26.30	32.65	34.71
bus	20	24.18	16.61	45.26	60.31	19.00	16.19	32.55	44.62	13.89	15.78	25.54	33.05	13.57	15.17	20.43	25.83
soccer	30	25.60	22.21	39.87	45.45	20.21	21.69	32.83	36.72	21.29	21.19	28.18	31.28	21.44	20.42	24.14	27.34
highway	30	34.45	32.13	42.15	43.45	32.83	31.50	38.37	39.39	29.35	30.42	35.38	36.30	28.63	27.83	33.18	33.98
hall	30	33.95	27.45	43.28	43.65	33.39	26.94	39.93	40.31	29.09	26.28	36.87	37.64	28.48	25.03	33.87	35.03
container	30	31.00	28.53	43.80	45.35	29.71	27.95	38.87	40.32	27.33	27.26	35.43	37.07	26.27	25.60	31.99	33.86
bus	30	19.37	16.17	35.02	43.15	19.98	15.81	27.79	32.95	16.90	15.43	22.98	26.52	13.04	14.80	19.27	22.29
soccer	40	26.57	22.18	36.25	39.12	25.46	21.67	30.96	33.12	21.12	21.12	27.15	29.19	21.47	20.34	23.75	26.19
highway	40	33.12	31.63	40.36	40.96	32.77	31.04	37.31	37.83	29.05	30.20	34.81	35.40	28.44	27.72	32.79	33.43
hall	40	34.70	26.17	43.41	43.40	33.44	25.57	40.27	40.48	29.41	24.95	37.11	37.78	28.45	23.97	33.97	35.38
container	40	30.28	27.13	41.80	42.53	30.81	26.60	37.72	38.54	27.46	26.13	35.14	36.32	27.09	24.75	31.89	33.56
bus	40	19.52	15.96	30.78	34.98	15.10	15.59	25.37	28.10	16.74	15.18	21.66	23.70	13.05	14.61	18.47	20.57
soccer	50	26.67	22.07	34.27	35.88	23.78	21.63	29.98	31.43	21.10	21.08	26.66	28.21	21.40	20.30	23.48	25.69
highway	50	33.38	31.43	39.27	39.52	32.90	30.97	36.67	36.92	29.01	30.08	34.37	34.77	28.54	27.66	32.59	33.15
hall	50	34.54	25.71	43.19	43.04	32.87	25.16	39.68	39.93	28.76	24.59	36.99	37.69	27.71	23.53	33.53	35.27
container	50	32.42	25.93	41.08	41.44	31.13	25.34	37.71	38.28	27.92	24.70	34.93	35.95	27.21	23.53	31.92	33.75
bus	50	22.47	15.89	28.28	30.66	18.85	15.51	23.97	25.59	16.46	15.08	20.85	22.26	13.10	14.57	18.08	19.73

Table A: Recovery performance - $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data
$$iRSE(\mathcal{L}) = -20\log\left(\frac{\|\mathcal{L}-\hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F}{\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}\|_F}\right) \text{ in dB}$$

Dataset	Rank	Percentage Missing (%)															
		60%				70%				80%				90%			
		GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed
soccer	20	19.41	18.91	19.00	25.52	11.98	15.41	12.54	21.78	11.06	10.59	7.42	17.34	3.70	5.39	3.40	9.48
highway	20	23.00	23.47	19.78	33.02	12.68	17.50	11.61	30.12	15.97	11.44	6.81	17.76	4.02	5.50	3.20	8.23
hall	20	24.29	22.44	22.54	32.91	12.63	16.41	12.92	29.60	11.97	10.93	7.41	21.36	3.89	5.39	3.39	9.50
container	20	23.55	22.36	23.79	31.73	12.46	16.86	13.55	28.38	12.25	11.32	7.68	22.82	3.57	5.54	3.49	10.20
bus	20	14.79	14.08	15.95	21.04	10.70	12.12	11.36	17.29	9.77	8.89	7.11	13.87	3.13	4.74	3.24	8.63
soccer	30	19.37	18.77	18.68	24.02	11.94	15.15	12.42	20.96	10.96	10.66	7.40	17.14	3.70	5.41	3.39	9.40
highway	30	23.11	23.57	19.75	31.93	12.69	17.57	11.60	29.64	16.14	11.44	6.77	17.46	3.99	5.55	3.19	8.19
hall	30	24.16	21.69	22.34	33.11	12.68	16.07	12.79	29.81	11.83	10.79	7.38	20.96	3.87	5.39	3.37	9.39
container	30	23.26	21.57	23.17	31.34	12.47	16.67	13.36	28.01	11.99	11.01	7.63	22.21	3.75	5.39	3.46	10.01
bus	30	14.60	13.87	15.34	19.07	10.33	11.96	11.11	16.31	9.81	8.81	6.98	13.43	3.14	4.61	3.19	8.42
soccer	40	19.18	18.55	18.50	23.51	11.98	15.23	12.29	20.74	10.91	10.73	7.39	16.97	3.76	5.37	3.39	9.42
highway	40	22.85	23.34	19.56	31.60	12.67	17.50	11.54	29.32	15.92	11.37	6.78	17.48	4.03	5.56	3.19	8.18
hall	40	23.92	21.12	22.10	33.35	12.59	16.07	12.69	29.73	11.74	10.89	7.39	20.80	3.88	5.43	3.36	9.32
container	40	23.40	21.14	22.90	31.32	12.52	16.27	13.29	28.05	11.93	10.93	7.59	21.75	3.83	5.52	3.44	9.87
bus	40	14.67	13.66	15.00	18.08	10.37	11.83	10.97	15.79	9.78	8.77	6.91	13.18	3.23	4.64	3.19	8.37
soccer	50	19.21	18.60	18.45	23.14	11.99	15.43	12.33	20.59	10.90	10.72	7.38	16.89	3.77	5.41	3.39	9.39
highway	50	22.88	22.90	19.62	31.43	12.69	17.42	11.55	29.28	16.10	11.43	6.74	17.23	3.99	5.44	3.19	8.16
hall	50	23.48	20.88	21.69	33.19	12.61	16.14	12.77	29.62	11.77	10.73	7.34	20.32	3.88	5.36	3.38	9.34
container	50	23.37	20.76	22.56	31.39	12.52	16.05	13.19	28.18	11.85	10.88	7.56	21.34	3.81	5.41	3.43	9.80
bus	50	14.59	13.57	14.79	17.55	10.46	11.72	10.88	15.52	9.68	8.73	6.87	13.03	3.26	4.52	3.14	8.21

Table B: Recovery performance - $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data

is increased to 50. For other methods, the corresponding values are 45.26dB (TC) and 30.78dB (TC) respectively. As the signal becomes complex the recovery performance deteriorate for all other methods. It is evident from the plots *Figure: 4*, *Figure: 5*, *Figure: 6*, *Figure: 7* and *Figure: 8* the proposed method offers better performance than its counterparts. ASSIM shows a similar dependence on percentage of missing samples and rank of tensor. The proposed method recovered the video without the loss of structure even if the percentage of missing samples is increased to 80%. It shows a considerable change only after 80% of the samples are lost. For container video ASSIM is 0.9999 and 0.9509 with 20% and 80% loss of information for the proposed method. However, the existing methods can attain


only 0.9998 (TC) and 0.7644 (TMAC) respectively. Analysis of the recovered videos shows that the proposed method is able to construct meaningful videos from almost completely lost videos. It is evident from the *Figure: 14*, *Figure: 15*, *Figure: 17*, *Figure: 16* and *Figure: 18*. Our experiments reveal that the proposed algorithm outperforms existing methods measured by all metrics even when the complexity of data increases considerably and large information loss exists in it. The proposed method can be extensively used to recover incomplete multi-dimensional signals and find applications in video completion, medical image recovery, random occlusion removal, hyper-spectral image recovery, video object removal, video compression etc.




Dataset	Rank	Average SSIM															
		Percentage Missing (%)															
		20%				30%				40%				50%			
		GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed
soccer	20	0.9627	0.9424	0.9999	1.0000	0.9498	0.9362	0.9979	0.9997	0.9112	0.9292	0.9898	0.9973	0.9230	0.9182	0.9675	0.9884
highway	20	0.9924	0.9827	0.9994	0.9997	0.9903	0.9842	0.9982	0.9989	0.9738	0.9809	0.9953	0.9968	0.9732	0.9687	0.9914	0.9933
hall	20	0.9943	0.9911	0.9996	0.9997	0.9939	0.9902	0.9990	0.9992	0.9858	0.9883	0.9977	0.9982	0.9841	0.9817	0.9955	0.9965
container	20	0.9947	0.9870	0.9998	0.9999	0.9907	0.9854	0.9990	0.9994	0.9791	0.9818	0.9973	0.9984	0.9780	0.9746	0.9942	0.9961
bus	20	0.9804	0.8812	0.9999	1.0000	0.9368	0.8701	0.9979	0.9999	0.8287	0.8592	0.9884	0.9980	0.8338	0.8415	0.9633	0.9891
soccer	30	0.9609	0.9381	0.9989	0.9997	0.8876	0.9307	0.9941	0.9976	0.9122	0.9243	0.9831	0.9914	0.9203	0.9127	0.9589	0.9787
highway	30	0.9912	0.9838	0.9985	0.9989	0.9878	0.9816	0.9965	0.9972	0.9734	0.9775	0.9930	0.9942	0.9704	0.9642	0.9886	0.9902
hall	30	0.9949	0.9784	0.9995	0.9995	0.9946	0.9761	0.9988	0.9989	0.9856	0.9729	0.9976	0.9979	0.9845	0.9658	0.9954	0.9963
container	30	0.9918	0.9839	0.9996	0.9997	0.9887	0.9819	0.9986	0.9989	0.9802	0.9790	0.9969	0.9978	0.9765	0.9715	0.9934	0.9954
bus	30	0.9421	0.8708	0.9987	0.9998	0.9509	0.8606	0.9930	0.9979	0.9058	0.8490	0.9780	0.9903	0.8153	0.8298	0.9490	0.9736
soccer	40	0.9695	0.9370	0.9973	0.9986	0.9647	0.9301	0.9907	0.9943	0.9098	0.9222	0.9784	0.9858	0.9208	0.9107	0.9549	0.9723
highway	40	0.9877	0.9822	0.9978	0.9981	0.9877	0.9799	0.9955	0.9960	0.9716	0.9764	0.9921	0.9930	0.9692	0.9638	0.9876	0.9889
hall	40	0.9957	0.9724	0.9995	0.9995	0.9946	0.9676	0.9989	0.9989	0.9863	0.9639	0.9977	0.9980	0.9841	0.9570	0.9955	0.9965
container	40	0.9894	0.9791	0.9993	0.9994	0.9918	0.9767	0.9983	0.9985	0.9813	0.9743	0.9968	0.9974	0.9806	0.9669	0.9936	0.9953
bus	40	0.9444	0.8673	0.9965	0.9987	0.8644	0.8559	0.9874	0.9934	0.9027	0.8432	0.9700	0.9811	0.8181	0.8259	0.9382	0.9602
soccer	50	0.9706	0.9353	0.9956	0.9970	0.9454	0.9295	0.9883	0.9914	0.9093	0.9217	0.9754	0.9820	0.9195	0.9101	0.9513	0.9682
highway	50	0.9885	0.9818	0.9972	0.9973	0.9882	0.9798	0.9948	0.9951	0.9715	0.9762	0.9913	0.9919	0.9697	0.9638	0.9870	0.9881
hall	50	0.9954	0.9692	0.9994	0.9994	0.9938	0.9653	0.9987	0.9988	0.9836	0.9603	0.9976	0.9978	0.9805	0.9522	0.9950	0.9963
container	50	0.9939	0.9733	0.9992	0.9993	0.9923	0.9702	0.9983	0.9984	0.9829	0.9660	0.9967	0.9973	0.9806	0.9569	0.9936	0.9954
bus	50	0.9727	0.8667	0.9936	0.9964	0.9388	0.8549	0.9823	0.9879	0.8976	0.8413	0.9638	0.9733	0.8203	0.8247	0.9322	0.9514




Table C: Recovery performance - Average SSIM for various video data




Dataset	Rank	Average SSIM															
		Percentage Missing (%)															
		60%				70%				80%				90%			
		GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed	GTNN	TMAC	TC	Proposed
soccer	20	0.8853	0.8924	0.8819	0.9685	0.6729	0.8234	0.6707	0.9316	0.6637	0.6891	0.4506	0.8437	0.4292	0.5014	0.2836	0.5871
highway	20	0.9147	0.9309	0.8382	0.9878	0.6309	0.8456	0.5669	0.9772	0.7812	0.6943	0.3884	0.8162	0.4142	0.4962	0.2605	0.5121
hall	20	0.9611	0.9526	0.9469	0.9939	0.7324	0.8676	0.7092	0.9884	0.7438	0.7256	0.4582	0.9405	0.4738	0.5170	0.2693	0.6088
container	20	0.9559	0.9483	0.9589	0.9920	0.7178	0.8826	0.7405	0.9845	0.7459	0.7644	0.4799	0.9509	0.4481	0.5526	0.2862	0.6563
bus	20	0.8582	0.8138	0.9021	0.9652	0.7427	0.7667	0.7825	0.9183	0.6852	0.6829	0.6082	0.8317	0.4987	0.5316	0.3959	0.6485
soccer	30	0.8825	0.8878	0.8740	0.9558	0.6709	0.8148	0.6657	0.9186	0.6572	0.6908	0.4505	0.8360	0.4286	0.5022	0.2824	0.5822
highway	30	0.9160	0.9317	0.8349	0.9841	0.6307	0.8409	0.5642	0.9741	0.7836	0.6948	0.3878	0.8072	0.4128	0.5016	0.2596	0.5082
hall	30	0.9593	0.9403	0.9449	0.9941	0.7367	0.8530	0.7037	0.9888	0.7334	0.7111	0.4546	0.9356	0.4668	0.5083	0.2655	0.5960
container	30	0.9547	0.9400	0.9547	0.9915	0.7238	0.8727	0.7339	0.9836	0.7397	0.7390	0.4757	0.9455	0.4639	0.5397	0.2821	0.6439
bus	30	0.8532	0.8043	0.8858	0.9432	0.7233	0.7547	0.7683	0.8945	0.6817	0.6686	0.5980	0.8104	0.4874	0.5152	0.3910	0.6340
soccer	40	0.8782	0.8833	0.8686	0.9500	0.6721	0.8151	0.6602	0.9132	0.6498	0.6913	0.4495	0.8303	0.4267	0.4980	0.2820	0.5802
highway	40	0.9116	0.9289	0.8309	0.9830	0.6306	0.8387	0.5618	0.9720	0.7748	0.6837	0.3849	0.8043	0.4082	0.4985	0.2592	0.5055
hall	40	0.9563	0.9311	0.9419	0.9942	0.7302	0.8479	0.6993	0.9884	0.7266	0.7142	0.4538	0.9316	0.4705	0.5097	0.2655	0.5926
container	40	0.9566	0.9347	0.9531	0.9919	0.7313	0.8572	0.7325	0.9846	0.7343	0.7338	0.4777	0.9435	0.4607	0.5395	0.2794	0.6341
bus	40	0.8563	0.7980	0.8757	0.9283	0.7286	0.7496	0.7613	0.8815	0.6789	0.6645	0.5964	0.8006	0.4883	0.5122	0.3894	0.6280
soccer	50	0.8783	0.8827	0.8665	0.9457	0.6713	0.8214	0.6609	0.9104	0.6503	0.6942	0.4481	0.8273	0.4263	0.5017	0.2818	0.5787
highway	50	0.9109	0.9213	0.8317	0.9824	0.6323	0.8326	0.5616	0.9719	0.7770	0.6840	0.3853	0.7986	0.4061	0.4914	0.2587	0.5038
hall	50	0.9508	0.9270	0.9372	0.9940	0.7274	0.8479	0.6987	0.9881	0.7265	0.7078	0.4504	0.9253	0.4644	0.5048	0.2656	0.5911
container	50	0.9570	0.9288	0.9510	0.9920	0.7310	0.8518	0.7300	0.9847	0.7288	0.7283	0.4735	0.9388	0.4607	0.5306	0.2779	0.6296
bus	50	0.8537	0.7975	0.8709	0.9200	0.7314	0.7452	0.7564	0.8736	0.6758	0.6602	0.5914	0.7940	0.4866	0.5046	0.3866	0.6210






Table D: Recovery performance - Average SSIM for various video data

Figure 4: $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 20$ and varying amount of missing data.

Figure 5: $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 30$ and varying amount of missing data.Figure 6: $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and varying amount of missing data.Figure 7: $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 20$ over the dataset.


 Figure 8: $iRSE(\mathcal{L})$ for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ over the dataset.

 Figure 9: Average SSIM for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 20$ and varying amount of missing data.

 Figure 10: Average SSIM for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 30$ and varying amount of missing data.

Figure 11: Average SSIM for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and varying amount of missing data.Figure 12: Average SSIM for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 20$ over the dataset.Figure 13: Average SSIM for various video data with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ over the dataset.

Figure 14: Recovered frames of *bus* video with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and 70% missing data.Figure 15: Recovered frames of *container* video with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and 70% missing data.Figure 16: Recovered frames of *hall* dataset with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and 80% missing data.Figure 17: Recovered frames of *highway* video with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and 70% missing data.Figure 18: Recovered frames of *soccer* dataset with $rank(\mathcal{L}) = 40$ and 50% missing data.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a sparsity enhanced version of tensor completion method by means of iterative re-weighted tensor nuclear norm minimization is proposed using t-SVD and its performance is verified by comparing with recently implemented techniques. The proposed method can be employed effectively for recovering multi-dimensional data from incomplete observations. From the results presented, it is found that proposed method behaves well in all situations including tensors with large tubular rank and excessive loss of data. The proposed method can be further extended to recover non-stationary panning camera video by reweighting twist tensor nuclear norm. Moreover to reduce the computational complexity of the proposed method conjugate symmetry property of Fourier transform can be exploited and efficient computation using FFT can be employed.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Guo, C. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and H. Liu, "An efficient svd-based method for image denoising," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 868–880, May 2016.
- [2] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, Jan. 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000016>
- [3] T. G. Kolda and B. W. Bader, "Tensor decompositions and applications," *SIAM Review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 455–500, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/07070111X>
- [4] W. Hu, D. Tao, W. Zhang, Y. Xie, and Y. Yang, "A new low-rank tensor model for video completion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02027*, 2015.
- [5] C. D. Martin, R. Shafer, and B. LaRue, "An order- $\$p\$ tensor factorization with applications in imaging," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. A474–A490, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/110841229>$
- [6] Y. Peng, J. Suo, Q. Dai, and W. Xu, "Reweighted low-rank matrix recovery and its application in image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 2418–2430, Dec 2014.
- [7] D. Goldfarb and Z. Qin, "Robust low-rank tensor recovery: Models and algorithms," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 225–253, 2014.
- [8] G. Varghese and Z. Wang, "Video denoising based on a spatiotemporal gaussian scale mixture model," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 1032–1040, 2010.
- [9] Z. Zhang and S. Aeron, "Exact tensor completion using t-svd," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.04689*, 2015.
- [10] M. E. Kilmer, K. Braman, N. Hao, and R. C. Hoover, "Third-order tensors as operators on matrices: A theoretical and computational framework with applications in imaging," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 148–172, 2013.
- [11] C. Lu, J. Feng, Y. Chen, W. Liu, Z. Lin, and S. Yan, "Tensor robust principal component analysis: Exact recovery of corrupted low-rank tensors via convex optimization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [12] X. Zhou, C. Yang, H. Zhao, and W. Yu, "Low-rank modeling and its applications in image analysis," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 47, no. 2, p. 36, 2015.
- [13] W. He, H. Zhang, L. Zhang, and H. Shen, "Total-variation-regularized low-rank matrix factorization for hyperspectral image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 178–188, 2016.
- [14] E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright, "Robust principal component analysis?" *J. ACM*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 11:1–11:37, Jun. 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1970392.1970395>
- [15] O. Semerci, N. Hao, M. E. Kilmer, and E. L. Miller, "Tensor-based formulation and nuclear norm regularization for multienergy computed tomography," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1678–1693, April 2014.
- [16] J. D. Carroll and J.-J. Chang, "Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an n-way generalization of "eckart-young" decomposition," *Psychometrika*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 283–319, 1970. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02310791>
- [17] L. D. Lathauwer, B. D. Moor, and J. Vandewalle, "A multilinear singular value decomposition," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1253–1278, 2000. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0895479896305696>
- [18] E. J. Candès, M. B. Wakin, and S. P. Boyd, "Enhancing sparsity by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization," *Journal of Fourier analysis and applications*, vol. 14, no. 5-6, pp. 877–905, 2008.
- [19] A. P. da Silva, P. Comon, and A. L. F. de Almeida, "A finite algorithm to compute rank-1 tensor approximations," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 959–963, July 2016.
- [20] D. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, April 2006.
- [21] J. Jia and C.-K. Tang, "Image repairing: Robust image synthesis by adaptive nd tensor voting," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2003. Proceedings. 2003 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2003, pp. I-643.
- [22] M. Bertalmio, A. L. Bertozzi, and G. Sapiro, "Navier-stokes, fluid dynamics, and image and video inpainting," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2001. CVPR 2001. Proceedings of the 2001 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2001, pp. I-355.
- [23] M. Bertalmio, G. Sapiro, V. Caselles, and C. Ballester, "Image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the 27th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 2000, pp. 417–424.
- [24] R. Molina, J. Mateos, and A. K. Katsaggelos, "Blind deconvolution using a variational approach to parameter, image, and blur estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 15, no. 12, pp. 3715–3727, 2006.
- [25] T. Chan, S. Esedoglu, F. Park, and A. Yip, "Recent developments in total variation image restoration," *Mathematical Models of Computer Vision*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2005.
- [26] M. Mahmoudi and G. Sapiro, "Fast image and video denoising via nonlocal means of similar neighborhoods," *IEEE signal processing letters*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 839–842, 2005.
- [27] H. Ji, S. Huang, Z. Shen, and Y. Xu, "Robust video restoration by joint sparse and low rank matrix approximation," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1122–1142, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/100817206>
- [28] R. Fitzek, "Yuv video sequences." [Online]. Available: <http://trace.eas.asu.edu/yuv/>
- [29] B. Madathil and S. N. George, "A novel dictionary-based approach for missing sample recovery of signals in manifold," *Signal, Image and Video Processing*, pp. 1–8, 2016.
- [30] N. Greeshma, M. Baburaj, and S. N. George, "Reconstruction of cloud-contaminated satellite remote sensing images using kernel pca-based image modelling," *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1–14, 2016.
- [31] Z. Zhang, G. Ely, S. Aeron, N. Hao, and M. Kilmer, "Novel methods for multilinear data completion and de-noising based on tensor-svd," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2014, pp. 3842–3849.
- [32] Y. Xu, R. Hao, W. Yin, and Z. Su, "Parallel matrix factorization for low-rank tensor completion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.1254*, 2013.
- [33] L. Grasedyck, D. Kressner, and C. Tobler, "A literature survey of low-rank tensor approximation techniques," *GAMM-Mitteilungen*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 53–78, 2013.
- [34] D. Kressner, M. Steinlechner, and B. Vandereycken, "Low-rank tensor completion by riemannian optimization," *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 447–468, 2014.
- [35] V. De Silva and L.-H. Lim, "Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1084–1127, 2008.
- [36] S. Weiland and F. van Belzen, "Singular value decompositions and low rank approximations of tensors," *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1171–1182, 2010.
- [37] J. Ye, "Generalized low rank approximations of matrices," *Machine Learning*, vol. 61, no. 1-3, pp. 167–191, 2005.
- [38] A. Krishnamurthy and A. Singh, "Low-rank matrix and tensor completion via adaptive sampling," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2013, pp. 836–844.
- [39] A. Cichocki, D. Mandic, L. De Lathauwer, G. Zhou, Q. Zhao, C. Caiafa, and H. A. Phan, "Tensor decompositions for signal processing

- applications: From two-way to multiway component analysis,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 145–163, 2015.
- [40] B. Alexeev, M. A. Forbes, and J. Tsimerman, “Tensor rank: Some lower and upper bounds,” in *Computational Complexity (CCC), 2011 IEEE 26th Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 283–291.
- [41] P. Comon, “Tensors: a brief introduction,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 44–53, 2014.
- [42] L. De Lathauwer, “A survey of tensor methods,” in *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 2773–2776.