

Accelerated Proximal Iterative re-Weighted ℓ_1 Alternating Minimization for Image Deblurring

Tarmizi Adam

Faculty of Computing

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Jalan Iman, 81310, Skudai, Johor, Malaysia
tarmizi.adam@utm.my

Alexander Malyshev

Department of Mathematics,

University of Bergen,

Postbox 7803, 5020 Bergen, Norway
Alexander.Malyshev@uib.no

Mohd Fikree Hassan

School of Information Technology,

Monash University Malaysia,

Jalan Lagoon Selatan, Bandar Sunway,
47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia
MohdFikree.Hassan@monash.edu

Nur Syarafina Mohamed

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Faculty of Sciences,

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

81310, Skudai, Johor, Malaysia
nursyarafina@utm.my

Md Sah Hj Salam

Faculty of Computing

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Jalan Iman, 81310, Skudai, Johor, Malaysia
sah@utm.my

Abstract—The quadratic penalty alternating minimization (AM) method is widely used for solving the convex ℓ_1 total variation (TV) image deblurring problem. However, quadratic penalty AM for solving the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p , $0 < p < 1$ TV image deblurring problems is less studied. In this paper, we propose two algorithms, namely proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 AM (PIRL1-AM) and its accelerated version, accelerated proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 AM (APIRL1-AM) for solving the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p TV image deblurring problem. The proposed algorithms are derived from the proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 (IRL1) algorithm and the proximal gradient algorithm. Numerical results show that PIRL1-AM is effective in retaining sharp edges in image deblurring while APIRL1-AM can further provide convergence speed up in terms of the number of algorithm iterations and computational time.

Index Terms—total variation, convex optimization, deblurring, nonconvex optimization, alternating minimization

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we are interested in the image deblurring problem obtained from the following image degradation model

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the observed noisy and blurred image, $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a blur kernel, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the uncorrupted image to be estimated, and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is additive Gaussian noise.

One way to solve (1) for the image \mathbf{u} is by minimizing the nonconvex nonsmooth composite optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2 + \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_p^p, \quad (2)$$

where $0 < p < 1$ and $\nabla \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the discrete difference operator [1]. If $p = 1$, problem (2) results in the convex ℓ_1 -norm total variation (TV) image restoration [2].

Operator splitting methods such as the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) and the alternating minimization (AM) [3], [4] for solving the convex ℓ_1 -norm TV

problem produces the sublinear convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$ which is quite slow in practice [5], [6]. Therefore, this has motivated researchers to accelerate these methods to improved the convergence rate to $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^2})$. However, the majority of the work in this direction is focused on convex optimization.

This paper, focuses on the model (2) when $0 < p < 1$ i.e., ℓ_p quasi-norm hence, the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p -norm TV. Our motivation mainly stems from the advantage of nonconvex nonsmooth penalties in restoring even sharper image quality compared to the ℓ_1 -norm TV [7]. Furthermore, this paper is further motivated by applying the quadratic penalty AM which is an operator splitting method for solving nonconvex nonsmooth image deblurring problems (2).

By this, we propose a proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 alternating minimization (AM) algorithm along with its accelerated version. The proposed algorithm uses the ideas of proximal operators and the iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 (IRL1) method [8] in combination with the alternating minimization method [3]. To accelerate the convergence of the proposed method, Nesterov acceleration is also used [9], [10].

II. RELATED WORKS

The alternating minimization (AM) method for solving the ℓ_1 TV image deblurring problem was initially proposed in [3]. An accelerated version employing acceleration techniques from [10] was further investigated in [11].

Specifically, it was shown that the ℓ_1 -norm sub minimization problem of the AM can be seen as a proximal gradient step. Hence, amenable to acceleration via the proximal gradient method [10]. However, the accelerated AM assumes the minimization problem to be convex.

The interesting link between AM and the accelerated proximal gradient method shown in [11] suggests that AM may have links with nonconvex proximal gradient type methods.

For example, the re-weighted ℓ_1 method that was originally proposed in [8] for nonconvex ℓ_p sparse recovery problems along with its proximal version [12], [13].

The proximal re-weighted ℓ_1 algorithm with acceleration is relatively new and studied in [14]–[16] and has shown promising results in minimizing problems of the form (2). However, their applications have been mainly restricted to sparse and low-rank matrix recovery problems. Furthermore, their connections with operator splitting methods such as AM for image deblurring have not been to our knowledge explored.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND ALGORITHM

In this paper, we focus on image deblurring by minimizing the nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problem (2). However, we restrict our results and discussion to a value of $p = 0.1$. By adding a quadratic penalty term to (2), we have

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{z}\|_p^p + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_2^2. \quad (3)$$

Indeed, problem (3) is equivalent to problem (2) with constraint $\mathbf{z} = \nabla \mathbf{u}$ [17]. To minimize (3), we can fix \mathbf{u} with the current value and minimize with respect to \mathbf{z} and vice-versa

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z}} \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{z}\|_p^p, \\ \mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_2^2. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Quadratic penalty AM scheme (4) is a classic method and commonly used in the image and signal processing literature [3], [17].

Note that the minimization problem concerning \mathbf{z} in (4) is the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p minimization problem hence, amenable to the iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 minimization algorithm [8]. If $p = 1$ in (4), this minimization problem is convex and solvable using soft thresholding [18]. Consequently, it was shown that it is equivalent to the proximal gradient update [11]

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{y}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_k), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}_k\|_2^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{z}\|_1, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_k = \nabla \mathbf{u}_k$, L is the Lipschitz constant of $f(\mathbf{y}_k) = \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}_k\|_2^2$, and $\nabla f(\mathbf{y}_k) = \beta(\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u})$. Due to this equivalence, the \mathbf{z} sub problem can be accelerated by the fast iterative shrinkage and thresholding algorithm (FISTA) [10].

A. Proximal Iterative re-Weighted ℓ_1 Alternating Minimization

With previous foundations in place, coming back to the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p minimization subproblem \mathbf{z} in (4), we have

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_k\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \|\mathbf{z}\|_p^p, \quad (6)$$

after a simple re-arrangement of β . The IRL1 approximately solves (6) by [8], [19]

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_k\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \sum_i w^i |z^i|, \quad (7)$$

where $w^i = p(|z_k^i| + \epsilon)^{p-1}$, and z^i are the weights and entries of vector \mathbf{z} respectively. Note that in (7) the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p minimization problem is approximated into a convex weighted ℓ_1 -norm minimization hence, IRL1 is a convex relaxation method for nonconvex optimization problems.

By introducing a diagonal weight matrix $\mathbf{W}_k = \text{diag}(w_k^1, \dots, w_k^n)$, IRL1 problem (7) can be written as

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_k\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \|\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{z}\|_1. \quad (8)$$

Problem (8) can be interpreted as solving a proximal linearization of the term $f(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|_2^2$ at $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k = \nabla \mathbf{u}_k$ i.e.,

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k), \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|_2^2 + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \|\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{z}\|_1, \quad (9)$$

hence, by ignoring constant terms can be written as [10], [20]

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{z}\|_1, \quad (10)$$

with $\mathbf{v}_k = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k)$ and $\lambda = \frac{\mu}{L\beta}$. Furthermore, by combining the weight entries with λ in the weight matrix \mathbf{W}_k we finally arrive at

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 + \frac{p\lambda}{(|z_k^i| + \epsilon)^{1-p}} \|\mathbf{z}\|_1, \quad (11)$$

where \bar{z}_k^i is the i^{th} entry of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k$ at the k^{th} iteration and ϵ a very small number to avoid division by zero. Equation (11) can be solved in a closed form via the soft-thresholding operation as

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}_k^i) \max\left(0, |\bar{z}_k^i| - \frac{p\lambda}{(|z_k^i| + \epsilon)^{1-p}}\right). \quad (12)$$

From (12), it can be seen that solving the original nonconvex subproblem (6) boils down to a series of proximal weighted ℓ_1 minimization problem.

The idea of proximal re-weighted ℓ_1 minimization has been proposed in [12] and its convergence behavior analyzed in [13]. However, the applications are mainly confined to sparse signal recovery and its use as a sub-minimization problem in the AM scheme (4) for image deblurring to our knowledge has not been studied.

Next, the sub-minimization problem for \mathbf{u}

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_2^2, \quad (13)$$

is a convex quadratic problem that can be solved by solving the following linear system

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K} + \beta \nabla^\top \nabla)^{-1} (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{f} + \beta \nabla^\top \mathbf{z}_{k+1}). \quad (14)$$

Taking into account equations (12) and (14), the complete listing for the proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 alternating minimization (PIRL1-AM) is listed as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 alternating minimization (PIRL1-AM)

Initialize: $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{z}_0, \mu > 0, \beta > 0, p = 0.1, L = 1$, and $k = 0$

1 **while not converged do**

$$\begin{array}{l} 2 \quad \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}_k^i) \max\left(0, |\bar{z}_k^i| - \frac{p\lambda}{(|z_k^i| + \epsilon)^{1-p}}\right), \\ 3 \quad \mathbf{u}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K} + \beta \nabla^\top \nabla)^{-1} (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{f} + \beta \nabla^\top \mathbf{z}_{k+1}), \\ 4 \quad k = k + 1 \end{array}$$

B. Accelerated Proximal Iterative re-Weighted ℓ_1 Alternating Minimization

To accelerate the proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 AM for the nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p TV image deblurring problem, accelerated techniques from [9], [10] can be used. Consider the sub-minimization problem (11), due to the convexity of (11) and its equivalence to minimizing a proximal linearization of $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2$ as discussed earlier, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \underset{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} f(\mathbf{v}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}_k), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_k \rangle \\ + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_k\|_2^2 + \tau \|\mathbf{z}\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\tau = \frac{p\lambda}{(|\bar{z}_k^i| + \epsilon)^{1-p}}$. Then, the acceleration strategies along the lines of [9], [10] can be employed, which involves the following iterative scheme

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \underset{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} f(\mathbf{y}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{y}_k), \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}_k \rangle \\ \quad + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}_k\|_2^2 + \tau \|\mathbf{z}\|_1, \\ t_k = \frac{k-1}{k+2}, \\ \mathbf{y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1} + t_k (\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}_k). \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

The \mathbf{z} minimization in (16) as discussed previously has a closed form solution of

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}_k^i) \max(0, |\bar{z}_k^i| - \tau). \quad (17)$$

In the iterative scheme (16), the scalar t_k is known as the Nesterov momentum coefficient and changes in each iteration k . The step \mathbf{y}_k is called the extrapolation step. Also, recall that $\mathbf{z}_k = \nabla \mathbf{u}_k$. Acceleration techniques of this form are shown to match the theoretical lower bound of $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ for smooth first-order convex optimization.

Having shown the equivalence between (11) and the proximal linearization step (15) along with its acceleration, the iterative scheme of the accelerated proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 AM (APIRL1-AM) taking account the sub minimization problem for \mathbf{u} is as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}_k^i) \max(0, |\bar{z}_k^i| - \tau), \\ t_k = \frac{k-1}{k+2}, \\ \mathbf{y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1} + t_k (\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}_k), \\ \mathbf{u}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K} + \beta \nabla^\top \nabla)^{-1} (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{f} + \beta \nabla^\top \mathbf{z}_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Algorithm 2: Accelerated proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 alternating minimization (APIRL1-AM)

Initialize: $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{z}_0, \mu > 0, \beta > 0, p = 0.1, L = 1$, and $k = 0$

1 **while not converged do**

$$\begin{array}{l} 2 \quad \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}_k^i) \max(0, |\bar{z}_k^i| - \tau) \\ 3 \quad t_k = \frac{k-1}{k+2} \\ 4 \quad \mathbf{y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1} + t_k (\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}_k) \\ 5 \quad \mathbf{u}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K} + \beta \nabla^\top \nabla)^{-1} (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{f} + \beta \nabla^\top \mathbf{z}_{k+1}). \\ 6 \quad k = k + 1 \end{array}$$

The complete algorithm is listed as Algorithm 2.

In Algorithms 1 and 2, the Lipschitz constant L is fixed to 1. In real applications, the value of L is usually unknown. The values of μ and β are used for computing $\lambda = \frac{\mu}{L\beta}$. Additionally, the linear system for solving \mathbf{u} can be solved very fast using the two-dimensional fast Fourier transforms (FFT) with complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ [3] while the \mathbf{z} problem is only of linear complexity $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, we apply the two proposed algorithms on the nonconvex nonsmooth image deblurring problem (2) and discuss the results of the proposed algorithms without and with acceleration.

A. Experimental Setup

For the experiments, the blurred and noisy images are obtained by the model (1). The blur kernel used is a Gaussian blur of size 17×17 pixel with $\sigma = 7$. Two blur levels were used namely, blur signal-to-noise ratio (BSNR) 30 and 20 [21]. The values for β are $\beta = 0.01$ and $\beta = 0.009$ for BSNR 20 and 30 respectively. The deblurring on each image was done 10 times and the average was taken.

All images are of size 512×512 pixels. Experiments were conducted using MATLAB¹ on an Intel Core i3-10105 CPU operating at 3.70 GHz with a memory of 4 Gb.

B. Results and discussion

Table I shows the results of the two proposed algorithms. In terms of image quality of PSNR and SSIM [22], the algorithms gave almost similar results. Some² of the deblurred images are shown in Figures 2 and 3. For BSNR 30 (less noise corruption), Figure 2 shows the ability of the methods in preserving sharp images.


However, there is a difference in terms of the number of iterations to converge to the required relative error value. For both BSNR levels tested, the acceleration technique used in APIRL1-AM manages to decrease the number of iterations to converge. Additionally, the time to converge also improves for APIRL1-AM compared to PIRL1-AM.

¹Codes at <https://github.com/tarmiziAdam2005/PIRL1-AM>


²Only deblurred images of APIRL1-AM are shown due to both algorithms giving very similar PSNR and SSIM values.

TABLE I: Image deblurring Results. Value of $\mu = 30, 60$ for Peppers and Cameraman respectively for BSNR 30. For BSNR 20, Value of $\mu = 100$ for both Peppers and Cameraman

BSNR lvl		APIRL1-AM				PIRL1-AM			
		PSNR	SSIM	Itr	T	PSNR	SSIM	Itr	T
30	<i>Peppers</i>	27.39	0.759	269	11.20	27.39	0.759	364	14.71
	<i>Cameraman</i>	26.03	0.763	228	9.50	26.04	0.762	324	13.12
20	<i>Peppers</i>	25.52	0.625	141	6.03	25.52	0.625	186	7.63
	<i>Cameraman</i>	24.49	0.570	225	9.64	24.49	0.570	244	10.02



(a)



(b)

Fig. 1: Convergence of the relative errors $\frac{\|\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k+1}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{u}_k\|_2} \leq 1 \times 10^{-8}$, produced by the iterates of APIRL1-AM and PIRL1-AM for imagem (a) *Peppers* (BSNR = 30) and (b) *Cameraman* (BSNR = 20).

Figure 1 compares the convergence between APIRL1-AM and PIRL1-AM. It can be seen that APIRL1-AM converges faster than PIRL1-AM and exhibits acceleration ripples akin to first-order accelerated techniques [23]. Taking into account similar results in terms of PSNR and SSIM of the two algorithms, acceleration gives an additional advantage for arriving at similar deblurring quality at a lower number of iterations and CPU time.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, two algorithms PIRL1-AM and APIRL1-AM were proposed for nonconvex nonsmooth ℓ_p TV image deblurring. The algorithms were derived by showing the




Fig. 2: Deblurred image *Peppers* BSNR= 30. (a) Original. (b) Blurred (PSNR = 22.97, SSIM = 0.659). (c) Zoomed. (d) APIRL1-AM deblurred.




Fig. 3: Deblurred image *Cameraman* BSNR= 20. (a) Original. (b) Blurred (PSNR = 21.65, SSIM = 0.499). (c) Zoomed. (d) APIRL1-AM deblurred.

links between the proximal gradient method and the proximal iterative re-weighted ℓ_1 . Both algorithms were able to retain sharp images for image deblurring. For algorithm convergence, APIRL1-AM exhibits the optimal $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^2})$ rate of convergence and improves the CPU time and the number of iterations to converge. Future works include establishing the convergence rate of both algorithms and applying them to different problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Lu, J. Duan, Z. Qiu, Z. Pan, R. W. Liu, and L. Bai, "Implementation of high-order variational models made easy for image processing," *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 39, no. 14, pp. 4208–4233, 2016.
- [2] L. I. Rudin, S. Osher, and E. Fatemi, "Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms," *Physica D: nonlinear phenomena*, vol. 60, no. 1-4, pp. 259–268, 1992.
- [3] Y. Wang, J. Yang, W. Yin, and Y. Zhang, "A new alternating minimization algorithm for total variation image reconstruction," *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 248–272, 2008.
- [4] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, J. Eckstein *et al.*, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [5] B. He and X. Yuan, "On the $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ convergence rate of the douglas–rachford alternating direction method," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 700–709, 2012.
- [6] A. Beck, "On the convergence of alternating minimization for convex programming with applications to iteratively reweighted least squares and decomposition schemes," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 185–209, 2015.
- [7] B. Zhang, G. Zhu, and Z. Zhu, "A tv-log nonconvex approach for image deblurring with impulsive noise," *Signal Processing*, vol. 174, p. 107631, 2020.
- [8] E. J. Candes, M. B. Wakin, and S. P. Boyd, "Enhancing sparsity by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization," *Journal of Fourier analysis and applications*, vol. 14, pp. 877–905, 2008.
- [9] Y. E. Nesterov, "A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$," in *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, vol. 269, no. 3. Russian Academy of Sciences, 1983, pp. 543–547.
- [10] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, "A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems," *SIAM journal on imaging sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 183–202, 2009.
- [11] J. Xie, A. Liao, and Y. Lei, "A new accelerated alternating minimization method for analysis sparse recovery," *Signal Processing*, vol. 145, pp. 167–174, 2018.
- [12] C. Lu, Y. Wei, Z. Lin, and S. Yan, "Proximal iteratively reweighted algorithm with multiple splitting for nonconvex sparsity optimization," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2014.
- [13] T. Sun, H. Jiang, and L. Cheng, "Global convergence of proximal iteratively reweighted algorithm," *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 68, pp. 815–826, 2017.
- [14] H. Wang, H. Zeng, and J. Wang, "An extrapolated iteratively reweighted ℓ_1 method with complexity analysis," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 967–997, 2022.
- [15] P. Yu and T. K. Pong, "Iteratively reweighted ℓ_1 algorithms with extrapolation," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 353–386, 2019.
- [16] D. N. Phan and T. N. Nguyen, "An accelerated irnn-iteratively reweighted nuclear norm algorithm for nonconvex nonsmooth low-rank minimization problems," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 396, p. 113602, 2021.
- [17] Z. Tan, Y. C. Eldar, A. Beck, and A. Nehorai, "Smoothing and decomposition for analysis sparse recovery," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1762–1774, 2014.
- [18] S. J. Wright and B. Recht, *Optimization for data analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [19] H. Wang, H. Zeng, J. Wang, and Q. Wu, "Relating ℓ_p regularization and reweighted ℓ_1 regularization," *Optimization Letters*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 2639–2660, 2021.
- [20] A. Beck, *First-order methods in optimization*. SIAM, 2017.
- [21] M. R. Banham and A. K. Katsaggelos, "Digital image restoration," *IEEE signal processing magazine*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 24–41, 1997.
- [22] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli, "Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity," *IEEE transactions on image processing*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 600–612, 2004.
- [23] B. O'donoghue and E. Candes, "Adaptive restart for accelerated gradient schemes," *Foundations of computational mathematics*, vol. 15, pp. 715–732, 2015.