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Abstract—Low-rank tensor completion (LRTC) that aims to restore the latent clean data from an incomplete and/or degraded observation, shows promising results in ubiquitous tensorial data completion applications. Most tensor completion approaches are vulnerable to outliers since their derivations are based on $\ell_2$-space to be robust against Gaussian noise. In this work, to tackle this issue, $\ell_p$-regression ($0 < p < 2$) is employed to achieve outlier resistance, where a factored form of tensor train (TT)-format representation is regularized by the low-TT-rank prior to exploit the inter-fibers correlation. On the basis of that, an effective iterative $\ell_p$-regression TT completion method (referred to $\ell_p$-TTC) is proposed, with the advantage of not requiring the hard-to-determine user-defined weights in TT rank model. Extensive experiment results are presented to demonstrate the outlier resistance of the proposed $\ell_p$-TTC, and showing the effective and superior performance in both bistatic MIMO radar localization and color image inpainting and denoising, compared with state-of-the-art tensor completion approaches.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Tensors, a.k.a., multidimensional multi-way arrays, are an effective higher-order generation of vectors and matrices [1]–[3]. The big data era endows immense opportunities for ubiquitous tensors and their decompositions applications by leveraging big data generated from widespread sensors and ever-growing computing capability. Benefiting from the power of multi-linear algebra as their mathematical backbone [4]–[6], they enable more efficient paradigm shift toward models for versatile data analysis tools, compared to their counterparts with standard flat-view matrix models. Therefore, they have become increasingly popular and omnipresent across diverse fields, ranging from signal and image processing, graphics, computer vision to data mining, machine learning, and brain modeling [7]–[11].

The success of low-rank matrix completion (LRMC) spurs numerous researchers to extend its concept to low-rank tensor completion (LRTC). In fact, due to the imperfection of data collection, transmission and compression, the high-dimensional data of interest are usually incomplete, hence, data completion is fertile research ground to ensure data integrity that merits further investigation. To this end, LRTC acts as a powerful computational tool for extracting valuable information from tensorial data. Given an observed incomplete high-dimensional data, the objective of LRTC aims to predict plausible missing entries by exploiting their correlation with the observed ones. This problem has been extensively studied in literature, and a growing number of promising LRTC methods have been proposed, instances include Bayesian CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (Bayesian CP) [12], high accuracy LRTC (HaLRTC) [8], fast LRTC (FaLRTC) [8], simple LRTC via tensor train (SiLRTC-TT) [7], tensor completion by parallel matrix factorization via tensor train (TMac-TT) [7], fixed-point iterative LRTC (FP-LRTC) [13], and tensor singular value decomposition (t-SVD) [14]. In [12], CP tensor factorization technique is introduced in tensor completion, where the latent CP rank is automatically determined by exploiting a fully Bayesian treatment. Still, however, it is challenging for LRTC because of the NP-hard CP rank minimization. Therefore, Tucker rank, as a promising alternative, is defined with the ranks of unfolded matrices along each order of a tensor. On the basis of Tucker decomposition, many works are proposed for image completion, and instances include [8], [15]–[18]. Liu et al. [8] proposes a pioneer idea to approximate the hard-to-handle CP rank function by the Tucker-based tensor nuclear norm, with resulting two methods, namely, HaLRTC and FaLRTC, by combining nuclear norms of all matrices unfolded along each mode. Both of them achieve satisfactory performance, while ignoring the structural information of the tensor data. In [15], Tucker decomposition with the
Alternating least squares algorithm and an additional lowpass Gaussian filtration are exploited to enhance the quality of image inpainting. Reference [16] adopts a doubly weighted strategy for nuclear norm along each mode to characterize global sparsity prior of tensor. In Tucker rank, we notice that unfolded matrices have unbalanced sizes, namely, varying numbers between rows and columns. Since the rank of an unfolded matrix is bounded by the minimal number of rows and columns, the inefficiency of rank minimization due to unbalance would render the resulting algorithms for capturing the global information of a tensor in vain.

To address that, tensor train (TT) rank [19] is defined, which consists of ranks of matrices unfolded in a well-balanced matricization way, i.e., unfolding the tensor along permutations of modes. On the basis of that, Bengua et al. [7] introduces the SiLRTC-TT and TMAC-TT approaches, which are extended from the SiLRTC [8] and multi-linear matrix factorization model, respectively. Using the matrix product state representation of TT decomposition, a tensor completion algorithm by alternating minimization under the TT model (TCAM-TT) is proposed in [20], which presents noticeably superior performance for a variety of real settings. On the other hand, to incorporate the data factor priors and tensor multi-linear structural information, a simultaneous tensor decomposition and completion (STDC) method is developed in [21]. Similar with the LRMC using approximate singular value decomposition (SVD) based fixed-point continuation algorithm (FPCA) [22], the FP-LRTC method in [13] is proposed by employing operator splitting and convex relaxation techniques. To characterize informational and structural complexity of multi-linear data, t-SVD [14] is employed with applications to three-dimensional (3-D) and 4-D video data completion and denoising from limited samples. Nevertheless, the tensor nuclear norm minimization (TNNM)-based algorithms suffer from high computation cost of multiple SVDs at each iteration. What is more, how to determine the best user-defined weights in TT rank is still an open problem. As mentioned above, most of the existing TNNM algorithms are based on the Frobenius norm to robustify against the Gaussian noise.

Whereas non-Gaussian noises or outliers commonly exist in many different types of data, e.g., image, video, text and bio-informatics. Many existing LRTC-based approaches explicitly or implicitly assume that the noise is Gaussian distributed [23], [24]. Therefore, the performance of these approaches may severely degrade due to the existence of outliers. Moreover, tensor decomposition with low-rank structures in TNNM is sensitive to the presence of outliers, as it attempts to force the outliers to fit the low-rank structure. It results in that the outliers to fit the low-rank structure. It results in that the outliers to fit the low-rank structure. It results in that theTLS method fails to work properly when the observations contain outliers as their derivations are based on the ℓ2-space, e.g., Frobenius norm of tensor residual error. Herein, outliers refer to outlying entries whose values are abnormally large. Numerous approaches have employed the fact that the entry-wise ℓp-norm with p < 2 is less sensitive to outliers than the Frobenius norm for robust LRTC. In [25] and [26], ℓp-norm (0 < p < 2) is involved to assist to address additive impulsive noise, with the resulting iteratively reweighted tensor SVD (IR-t-SVD) and ℓp-PARAFAC methods, to recover the target tensor, respectively. This is also under consideration for LRTC purposes.

In this work, we propose to complete tensoral data from both randomly missing entries and outliers based on a factorized form of TT-format representation. In our model, the latent tensor is regularized by the low-TT-rank prior to exploit the inter-fibers correlation, which is motivated by the fact that TT rank enables better to capture the global correlation between tensor entries for LRTC compared to its counterpart, namely, Tucker rank [7], [27]. We derive a promising method using the combination of alternating minimization and alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) under the ℓp-regression (0 < p < 2; p = 0) framework. The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- Owing to the fact that it is challenging to determine the best user-defined weights in TT rank model, we propose to employ ℓp-regression based on tensor factorization for solving LRTC problems.
- To be robust against both missing entries and outliers, an effective iterative ℓp-regression tensor train completion method (ℓp-TTC) is developed, where ADMM is applied as the solver under the framework of augmented Lagrangian multiplier.
- Finally, compared with state-of-the-art tensor completion approaches, numerical experiments have been conducted to verify the efficacy and superiority of the proposed ℓp-TTC on both simulated and visual data, for bistatic multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) radar localization and color image inpainting and denoising, respectively. The code is available at https://sites.google.com/site/qiulicuiyu/discussion.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the LRTC problem is formulated, where notations and preliminaries on tensor decomposition are introduced. In Section III, we propose the iterative ℓp-regression tensor completion method based on the TT model. Numerical experiment results are presented on LRTC with applications to bistatic MIMO radar localization, and color image inpainting and denoising in Section IV. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section V.

II. Background

A. Preliminaries

In this work, we adopt the tensor notations and preliminaries from [5]. The order or mode of a tensor is defined as the number of tensor dimensions. Scalars, a.k.a., zero-order tensors, are denoted by lowercase letters (x, y, z, · · · ). The first-order and second-order tensors, namely, vectors and matrices, are denoted by boldface lowercase letters (x, y, z, · · · ) and uppercase boldface letters (X, Y, Z, · · · ), respectively. Tensors with higher order are represented by calligraphic uppercase boldface letters (X, Y, Z, · · · ). An N-mode or N-order tensor, is denoted as X ∈ R I1×···×IN, where Ik is the dimension along mode k and its element is expressed by X(i1, · · · , ik, · · · , iN), 1 ≤ ik ≤ Ik, 1 ≤ k ≤ N. A mode-k fiber of a tensor X is a vector defined by fixing all indices except for the kth index.

Definition 1 (Mode-k Matricization or Unfolding): A tensor X ∈ R I1×···×IN is unfolded or reshaped into a matrix.
The set $\Omega_1$ given by the index set $X_3$ is defined as

$$X_3 = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k, \ldots, i_N\},$$

where $J_n = \prod_{m=1, m \neq k}^{n-1} I_m$.

Definition 2 (Tensor Connect Product [19, 28]): For two $3$-rd-order tensors $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}$, the tensor connect product is defined as:

$$
\mathcal{X} \mathcal{Y} = \text{reshape}((X(i_1))^T \times (Y(i_1))) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times (n_2 n_3)}
$$

where reshaped() refers to the reshape operator which returns an array of specified dimensions with the same entries as the input data. Tensor connect product is to calculate the product of two 3rd-tensors where the tensors are first unfolded into matrices, and then the product of two matrices is computed. Notice that the last dimension of the former must be equal to the first dimension of the latter.

Definition 3 (Tensor Permutation From Lemma 2 [20]): Given $N$th-order tensor $X \in \mathbb{R}^{l_1 \times \cdots \times l_N}$, the $k$th TT permutation is $X^{P_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_{k+1} \times \cdots \times l_N \times l_1 \cdots l_{k-1}}$ with element of $X^{P_k}(j_k, \ldots, j_N, j_1, \ldots, j_{k-1}) = X(j_1, \ldots, j_N)$, for any $j_k \in [1, I_k]$. Therefore, we get $X^{P_k} = \text{Trunc}_k(X_{X_{1\ldots k}} \cdots X_N X_1^{X_{1\ldots k-1}})$. As shown in Fig. 1, the TT-format, a.k.a., TT network, is illustrated [29, 30].

B. Problem Formulation

Given a low-rank incomplete tensor $T_\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{l_1 \times \cdots \times l_N}$ with missing entries where $\Omega$ is a subset of the complete set of entries $[I_1] \times \cdots \times [I_N]$, with $[I]$ being the list $[1, \ldots, I]$. The set $\Omega$ contains all tensor coordinates corresponding to the observed entries in tensor $T$, and the subscript (.)$\Omega$ denotes the projection on the known entries. The task of LRTC is to complete the $N$th-order tensor $T$ from its known entries given by the index set $\Omega$. Mathematically, it is formulated as a rank minimization problem by incorporating the low-rank information:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \text{rank} (\mathcal{X}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathcal{X}_\Omega = T_\Omega. \tag{3}
$$

Due to the combinatorial nature of the rank function, the rank minimization (3), however, is NP-hard. Many attempts have been proposed to relax the underlying tensor rank, including CP rank, Tucker rank, and TT rank.

For the Tucker rank, (3) is written by the following Tucker rank optimization problem [31, 32]:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k \text{rank}(X_{(k)}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathcal{X}_\Omega = T_\Omega. \tag{4}
$$

where $(a_k)_{k=1}^{N}$ are defined as the nonnegative weights for rank$(X_{(k)})$ satisfying the condition $\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k = 1$. Nevertheless, Tucker rank is conceptually limited by the small upper bound of each individual rank and may not be suitable for describing global information of tensor [7], because of its ranks of matrices stemming from unbalanced matricization scheme, which is only efficient for more balanced matrices.

To deal with that, another type of tensor rank is the TT rank. For the ease of optimization, a popular and practical solution is to replace the nonconvex rank by convex nuclear norm, resulting in the TT nuclear norm optimization problem [7, 33]:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k \|X_{(k)}\|_*, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathcal{X}_\Omega = T_\Omega \tag{5}
$$

with TT rank combining more balanced unfolded matrices compared to Tucker rank, for tensor $X \in \mathbb{R}^{l_1 \times \cdots \times l_N}$ . Herein, $(X_{(k)})$ are obtained by matricizing along mode $k$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$. The nuclear norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ represents the sum of singular values $\lambda_k$, namely, $\|X\|_* = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k$ for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

Corrupted by the noise, (5) is modified as:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k \|X_{(k)}\|_*, \quad \text{s.t. } \|\mathcal{X}_\Omega - T_\Omega\|_F \leq \delta \tag{6}
$$

where $\delta > 0$ stands for the noise tolerance that controls the fitting error, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a tensor by $\|X\|_F = \|\text{vec}(X)\|_2$. $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ denote the $\ell_2$-norm and vectorization operators, respectively. Although (6) works well in the presence of additive Gaussian disturbance, its performance can significantly degrade when $T_\Omega$ contains outliers. Moreover, how to choose the best user-defined parameters $(a_k)_{k=1}^{N}$ is still an open problem.

III. ITERATIVE $\ell_p$-REGRESSION TT COMPLETION

It is well known that $\ell_2$-space optimization cannot resist impulsive noise effectively. In contrast, $\ell_p$-norm enables to be robust against impulsive noise as it reduces the effect of outliers via calculating the residual to power of $p$ with $0 < p < 2$. Therefore, in this work, we recast the problem (6) using $\ell_p$-regression:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \|\mathcal{X}_\Omega - T_\Omega\|_p \tag{7}
$$

to achieve outlier resistance. Obviously, (7) is hard to solve because of the high nonconvexity of $\ell_p$-norm.

Motivated by the Definition 2, (7) is written as:

$$
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \|\mathcal{X}_1 \cdots \mathcal{X}_N - T_\Omega\|_p \tag{8}
$$

based on the assumption of TT rank information.

Remark 1: Regarding the TT rank of a sequence of tensors, they can be determined directly by the diagonal singular
matrices \( \{\lambda_{i}^{[k]}\}_{i=1}^{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k} \times r_{k}} \). Based on the Vidal’s decomposition [34], the tensor can be rewritten by

\[
X_{k} = \sum_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{N}} u_{[1 \cdots k]} \lambda_{i}^{[k]} v_{[k+1 \cdots N]}^{[k+1 \cdots N]}(k) = I_{k}^{[1]} \lambda^{[1]} \cdots I_{k}^{[k]} \lambda^{[k]} \otimes_{\ell=1}^{k} e_{\ell}
\]

where \( u_{[1 \cdots k]} \lambda^{[k]} \) and \( v_{[k+1 \cdots N]}^{[k+1 \cdots N]} \) are the modes of the tensor and \( e_{\ell} \) is the basis vector associated with mode \( \ell \).

Moreover, borrowing the results from the TT decomposition [19], i.e., tensor factorization, the element of tensor \( X \) can be expressed as:

\[
X(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{k}, \ldots, i_{N}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{k} \lambda^{[\ell]}(i_{\ell}, \ldots, i_{\ell}) \prod_{\ell=k+1}^{N} \lambda^{[\ell]}(i_{\ell}, \ldots, i_{\ell})
\]

where \( \lambda^{[\ell]}(i_{\ell}, \ldots, i_{\ell}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{\ell} \times r_{\ell}} \), and \( r_{1} \times r_{N} = 1 \). Specifically, \( \lambda_{1} \) and \( \lambda_{N} \) are the actual boundary matrices with the sizes of \( r_{1} \times r_{1} = 1 \) and \( r_{N} \times r_{N} = 1 \), respectively.

From (10), we observe that

\[
\mathcal{X}(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{N}) = \text{Trace}(\mathcal{X}(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{1}) \cdots \mathcal{X}(i_{N}, \ldots, i_{N}))
\]

for the scalar \( \mathcal{X}(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{N}) \), where \( \text{Trace}(\cdot) \) denotes the trace operator. Hence, (8) can be further optimized by involving the trace operator, that is:

\[
\min_{\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{N}} ||\text{Trace}(\lambda_{1} \cdot \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{N})\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}||_{F}^{p}
\]

Different with [2], [35], tensor factorization is exploited to avoid SVD computation. This allows the target tensor to be obtained as \( \lambda^{[k]} = \lambda_{1} \cdot \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{N} \).

In this work, we adopt the alternating minimization strategy to solve (12), we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{1}^{[+1]} &= \arg \min_{\lambda_{1}} \|\text{Trace}(\lambda_{1} \cdot (\lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{N}))\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}\|_{F}^{p} \\
\lambda_{2}^{[+1]} &= \arg \min_{\lambda_{2}} \|\text{Trace}(\lambda_{1}^{[+1]} \cdot \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{N})\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}\|_{F}^{p} \\
&\vdots \\
\lambda_{N}^{[+1]} &= \arg \min_{\lambda_{N}} \|\text{Trace}(\lambda_{1}^{[+1]} \cdots \lambda_{N}^{[+1]}\lambda_{N})\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}\|_{F}^{p}
\end{align*}
\]

with updating one tensor \( \lambda_{k} \) by fixing others for each step, \( 1 \leq k \leq N \). Now, we focus on solving (13) for an \( \lambda_{k} \):

\[
\lambda_{k}^{[+1]} = \arg \min_{\lambda_{k}} \|\text{Trace}(\lambda_{1}^{[+1]} \cdots \lambda_{k}^{[+1]} \cdots \lambda_{N}^{[+1]}\lambda_{k})\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}\|_{F}^{p}
\]

by using mode-\( k \) matricization. Recall that \( X_{(k)} \) is obtained by unfolding along mode-\( k \) and its rank captures the correlation between \( k \) modes and the other \( N - k \) modes. Hence, it enables better to capture the global correlation of a tensor in (15) as it encompasses of correlations between permutations of all modes [7]. On the basis of that each slice of \( \lambda_{k} \), namely, \( \lambda_{k}(i_{k}, \ldots, i_{k}) \), \( 1 \leq i_{k} \leq r_{k} \), corresponds to each row of \( X_{(k)} \), we can solve (15) by separate manner with \( k \) similar subproblems.

Regarding \( i_{k} \)th subproblem, we have:

\[
\lambda_{k}^{[+1]}(i_{k}, i_{k}, \ldots) = \arg \min_{\lambda_{(k)}} \bigg( \|\text{Trace}(\lambda_{k}^{[+1]} U_{(k)}))\Omega - (\mathcal{R}_{\Omega}(i_{k}, \ldots))\|_{F}^{p}
\]

where \( X \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k} \times r_{k}} \) and \( \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}(i_{k}, \ldots) \) denotes a subset of the complete set of entries \( \{r_{k}\} \times \{i_{k+1}, \ldots, i_{k}\} \times \{1, \ldots, r_{1}\} \times \{1, \ldots, r_{N}\} \). The second equality is derived due to the entry-wise summation of all entries. For each \( j \in \{\mathcal{R}_{\Omega}(i_{k}, \ldots)\} \), \( U_{(k)}^{[+1]}(i_{k}, \ldots, i_{k}) \) can be regarded as a matrix of size \( r_{k} \times r_{k} \). Following the results of linear algebra, \( \text{Trace}(U_{(k)}^{[+1]} = \text{vec}(U_{(k)}^{[+1]} \cdot T_{(k)}\text{vec}(U)) \) for any matrices \( U_{(k)}^{[+1]} \). Therefore, (16) is further modified as:

\[
\lambda_{k}^{[+1]}(i_{k}, i_{k}, \ldots) = \arg \min_{\lambda_{(k)}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}(i_{k}, \ldots)} \|\text{vec}(U_{(k)}^{[+1]}(i_{k}, \ldots, i_{k}))\Omega - \mathcal{R}_{\Omega}(i_{k}, \ldots))\|_{F}^{p}
\]

where (\cdot)^{T} stand for the transpose operator. For the ease of simplicity, (17) is rewritten as:

\[
\lambda_{k}^{[+1]}(i_{k}, \ldots) = \arg \min_{\lambda_{(k)}} \|\text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - \gamma\|_{F}^{p}
\]

where \( \lambda_{(k)} = \text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - \gamma \) and \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k} \times r_{k}} \). Let \( e_{(k)} \) equal to \( \text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - \gamma \), then it is necessary to convert the unconstrained problem into a constrained one, that is:

\[
\min_{e} \|e\|_{F}^{p}, \quad \text{s.t. } e = \text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - \gamma
\]

The augmented Lagrangian of (19) is:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\mu}(e, X, \Lambda) = \|e\|_{F}^{p} + (\langle \Lambda, \text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - e \rangle + \mu \|\text{vec}(X_{(k)}) - e\|_{2}^{2}
\]

where \( \Lambda \) is a vector of Lagrange multipliers. It is difficult to minimize the objective function over multiple sets of variables. The popular and practical solution is applying ADMM [36] as the solver to alternatively optimize one set of variables with others fixing. To solve (20), the main steps corresponding to ADMM are concluded as follows:

\[
X_{k+1} = \arg \min_{X} \mathcal{L}_{\mu}(e^{l}, X, \Lambda^{l})
\]

\[
e^{l+1} = \arg \min_{e} \mathcal{L}_{\mu}(e, X^{l+1}, \Lambda^{l})
\]

\[
\Lambda^{l+1} = \Lambda^{l} + \mu \text{vec}(X^{l+1}) - e^{l+1}
\]
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vividly observe that the proposed method provides different performance with respect to \( p \) in terms of peak signal-to-noise (PSNR), where four results are obtained from \( p = 0.4, 0.8, 1.2, \) and 1.8, respectively.

**IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

In this section, we evaluate the proposed \( \ell_p \)-TTC method with extensive experiments on both simulated complex data and real visual data. The proposed method is benchmarked against APGL [40], FPCA [22], FP-LRTC [13], HaLRTC [8], conventional PARAFAC [41] with full data and Cramér-Rao lower bound (CRLB) [42] for bistatic MIMO radar localization, and TCAM-TT [20], FaLRTC [8], SiLRTC [7], \( \ell_p \)-PARAFAC [26] and IR-t-SVD [25] for color image inpainting and denoising, respectively.

**A. Bistatic MIMO Radar Localization**

In this section, the problem of source localization in bistatic MIMO radar is tackled via LRTC, where the direction of departure (DOD) and direction of arrival (DOA) are jointly estimated with the only available partial data at the front-end during multiple pulse periods. We consider the MIMO radar configuration with following parameters:

- Both transmit and receive arrays are uniform linear arrays (ULA) with \( M_t \) and \( M_r \) colocated antennas, respectively. \( d_t \) and \( d_r \) stand for the respective inter-element distances of antennas.
- \( K \) targets in the far-field, where \( \{\theta_{mk}\}_{k=1}^{K} \) and \( \{\phi_{nk}\}_{k=1}^{K} \) denote the DODs and DOAs with respect to the \( m \)th transmit and \( n \)th receive array normal, respectively;
- The transmit and receive steering matrices respectively are \( A = [a(\theta_1), \ldots, a(\theta_K)] \in \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times K} \) and \( B = [b(\phi_1), \ldots, b(\phi_K)] \in \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times K} \), with the steering vectors relative to ULA being \( a(\theta_k) = [1, e^{j2\pi d_t \sin(\theta_k)/\lambda}, \ldots, e^{j2\pi d_t (K-1) \sin(\theta_k)/\lambda}]^T \) and \( b(\phi_k) = [1, e^{j2\pi b_t \sin(\phi_k)/\lambda}, \ldots, e^{j2\pi b_t (K-1) \sin(\phi_k)/\lambda}]^T \).
- The coherent processing interval (CPI) consists of \( Q \) consecutive pulses and the radar cross section (RCS) is varying independently from pulse to pulse, where the RCS coefficients follow the Swerling II model [43]. \( C = [c_1, \ldots, c_Q]^T \) with \( c_p = [\gamma_{1p}, \ldots, \gamma_{Kp}]^T \) accounts for the Doppler effect and RCS fading;
- \( S_t = [s_1, \ldots, s_M_t]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times L} \) holds the \( M_t \) narrowband pulse waveforms transmitted by the \( m \)th subarray, \( L \) being the number of samples per pulse period. The transmitted orthogonal waveforms are the columns of a Hadamard matrix.

Stacking \( Q \) pulses, \( M_t \times M_r \times Q \) tensor \( T \) is obtained by following the PARAFAC model, details refer to [40], [44]:

\[
T = I_{K \times 1} B_{2 \times 3} A_{3 \times 1} C + \mathcal{N}
\]

(32)

\[
\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{I}_{\Omega}
\]

(33)

where \( \mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K \times K} \) is an identity tensor, \( \mathcal{N} \) denotes the noise tensor, and \( \mathcal{X} \) is the partially observed data. Given the restored \( \mathcal{X} \), the matched-filter output can be obtained. Then the DODs and DOAs are computed via conventional parameter estimators, such as [45]. In our simulations, \( M_t = M_r = 20, K = 5, Q = 256, L = 256 \) and \( \{\theta_k, \phi_k\}_{k=1}^{K} = \{[10^\circ, -30^\circ], [20^\circ, -15^\circ], [30^\circ, 5^\circ], [-10^\circ, 15^\circ], [0^\circ, 25^\circ]\} \). It is worth noting that since the simulated data for MIMO radar localization is complex, it should be transformed to real-valued data [46], and then restored by the proposed \( \ell_p \)-TTC. Also, we can restore the target tensor from the real and imaginary parts, respectively. In addition, all algorithms are evaluated on degraded tensorial data with total missing ratio \( \rho \) at \( \rho = 40\% \).
To measure the performance of the proposed method, the average mean square error (AMSE) between the estimated parameters and the original ones is used, which is defined as:

$$\text{AMSE} = \frac{1}{MK} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\hat{\xi}_m^k - \tilde{\xi}_m^k)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

where $M$ is the number of Monte Carlo trials, and $\hat{\xi}_m^k$ is the estimate of parameter $\xi_k$ in the $m$th trial. Herein, $\hat{\xi}_m^k$ denotes the DOD $\theta_k$ or DOA $\phi_k$, and $M = 100$.

In Fig. 5, the Swerling II model is chosen and we compare the proposed method versus state-of-the-art LRTC-based localization techniques via a Monte Carlo simulation, including APGL, FPGA, FP-LRTC, HaLRTC, the proposed $\ell_p$-TTC at $p = 1$ and CRLB. Moreover, the performance of the conventional PARAFAC method [41] based on full data is provided as benchmark. In this experiment, the performance of the proposed method robust against Gaussian mixture model (GMM) noise [47], [48] is investigated. GMM enables to well model the phenomenon in the presence of both Gaussian noise and outliers. Similar with [48], the ratio between variances of two-term Gaussian mixture noise is 100, signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) $= 30$ dB, and 10% noise samples are considered as outliers. From Fig. 5, we observe that the proposed method shows the best estimation performance among all approaches.

To further evaluate the performance of the proposed method, AMSE versus SNR is conducted in the presence of Gaussian noise [49], as shown in Fig. 6. The SNR is varied from 0 dB to 30 dB. Different with Fig. 5, the conventional PARAFAC method with full data is close to CRLB in Gaussian noise, which is also employed as the baseline in our work. For DOD estimation, it can be seen that the proposed $\ell_p$-TTC outperforms all compared approaches, and achieves the best
performance among them for DOA estimation but is on par with APGL. Moreover, we observe that LRMC-based method, like FPCA, is inferior to LRTC-based ones.

In Table I, we compare the proposed method with numerous tensor completion approaches in different missing ratios from 30% to 70%, for bistatic MIMO radar localization. Unless otherwise specified, the parameter settings are the same as mentioned before. The quantitative results have clearly shown that the proposed method is superior to other compared methods, at least 2 order of magnitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithms</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APGL</td>
<td>0.18151</td>
<td>0.23607</td>
<td>0.31104</td>
<td>0.33955</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCA</td>
<td>0.17923</td>
<td>0.23411</td>
<td>0.282776</td>
<td>0.32965</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T^{L}_LRTC</td>
<td>0.33933</td>
<td>0.34415</td>
<td>0.36938</td>
<td>0.41883</td>
<td>0.46733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T^{L}_TTC</td>
<td>0.33934</td>
<td>0.33856</td>
<td>0.36756</td>
<td>0.41350</td>
<td>0.46997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T^{p}_TTC</td>
<td>0.00975</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>0.00538</td>
<td>0.00458</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I**

**COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED METHOD WITH STATE-OF-THE-ART TENSOR COMPLETION APPROACHES IN DIFFERENT MISSING RATIOS AND GMM NOISE, WHERE MSE IS APPLIED AS THE METRIC TO EVALUATE THE PERFORMANCE**

B. Color Image Inpainting and Denoising

Most of the existing image inpainting algorithms are developed for grayscale images. It is not trivial to extend them for color image inpainting since the noise statistics in R, G, and B channels can be very different for real noisy images except for the existence of outliers. In this section, simulation results are carried out to demonstrate the completion and denoising performance of the proposed $\ell_p$-TTC ($p = 1$) on the standard color image set, including *Windows* (300 × 300 × 3), *Pillars* (300 × 300 × 3), *Peppers* (317 × 316 × 3), *House* (225 × 225 × 3), *Lenna* (220 × 220 × 3), *Building2* (300 × 300 × 3), *Sea* (300 × 300 × 3), *Tree* (300 × 300 × 3), and *Shadow* (360 × 640 × 3).

Two objective measures, namely, PSNR and structural similarity (SSIM) [50] indexes, are adopted to provide quantitative and quality evaluations of the inpainting and denoising results. Since the PSNR is often inconsistent with human eye perception, even though it is the mostly used quality measure, the SSIM is employed to comprehensively reflect the performance. For the ground truth image $X$ and the restored image $\hat{X}$, the PSNR is defined as:

$$\text{PSNR} = 10\log_{10}\frac{255^2}{\text{MSE}}$$

where 255 is the peak value of the color image under concern, with the mean squares error (MSE) given by

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{||X - \hat{X}||_F^2}{||X||_F^2}$$

Therefore, the smaller the MSE, the larger the PSNR, which implies the better performance.

The inpainting and denoising performance of the proposed method is examined with comparison to the state-of-the-art tensor completion approaches, including TTC [7], FaLRTC [8], SiLRTC [7], $\ell_p$-PARAFAC [26] and IR-t-SVD [25]. The results are presented in Fig. 7, where 30% total entries are missing and the density of salt-and-pepper noise is 0.5. We can see that the proposed $\ell_p$-TTC achieves the highest PSNR and SSIM on three color images, namely,
Fig. 8. The test images for Table II, namely, House (225 × 225 × 3), Lenna (220 × 220 × 3), Building2 (300 × 300 × 3), Sea (300 × 300 × 3), Tree (300 × 300 × 3), and Shadow (360 × 640 × 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Algorithms</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.02599</td>
<td>0.01546</td>
<td>0.01315</td>
<td>0.01248</td>
<td>0.01928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.04946</td>
<td>0.04306</td>
<td>0.03629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.09285</td>
<td>0.09921</td>
<td>0.10682</td>
<td>0.11825</td>
<td>0.13021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.08565</td>
<td>0.09572</td>
<td>0.10573</td>
<td>0.11761</td>
<td>0.13074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.04755</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>0.04156</td>
<td>0.03852</td>
<td>0.03125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenna</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.03629</td>
<td>0.03867</td>
<td>0.04281</td>
<td>0.03229</td>
<td>0.03007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.08387</td>
<td>0.06406</td>
<td>0.05281</td>
<td>0.04679</td>
<td>0.04944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.11711</td>
<td>0.12311</td>
<td>0.13064</td>
<td>0.14182</td>
<td>0.15743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.10971</td>
<td>0.12012</td>
<td>0.12963</td>
<td>0.14132</td>
<td>0.15712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.09235</td>
<td>0.06011</td>
<td>0.09573</td>
<td>0.09533</td>
<td>0.06341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building2</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.00316</td>
<td>0.00335</td>
<td>0.000297</td>
<td>0.00293</td>
<td>0.00291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.03323</td>
<td>0.02515</td>
<td>0.02031</td>
<td>0.01722</td>
<td>0.01582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.05410</td>
<td>0.06493</td>
<td>0.07442</td>
<td>0.08534</td>
<td>0.09664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.05161</td>
<td>0.06351</td>
<td>0.07322</td>
<td>0.08411</td>
<td>0.09532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.01042</td>
<td>0.00992</td>
<td>0.00912</td>
<td>0.00933</td>
<td>0.00912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.00842</td>
<td>0.00478</td>
<td>0.000374</td>
<td>0.00349</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.0528</td>
<td>0.04048</td>
<td>0.03523</td>
<td>0.02982</td>
<td>0.02604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.06744</td>
<td>0.07455</td>
<td>0.08456</td>
<td>0.09646</td>
<td>0.10515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.06361</td>
<td>0.07262</td>
<td>0.08425</td>
<td>0.09635</td>
<td>0.10464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.02053</td>
<td>0.01613</td>
<td>0.01571</td>
<td>0.01567</td>
<td>0.01539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.02673</td>
<td>0.02239</td>
<td>0.01994</td>
<td>0.01913</td>
<td>0.01858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.11046</td>
<td>0.0807</td>
<td>0.06625</td>
<td>0.05448</td>
<td>0.04813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.13171</td>
<td>0.14101</td>
<td>0.15433</td>
<td>0.16823</td>
<td>0.18422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.12623</td>
<td>0.13913</td>
<td>0.15233</td>
<td>0.16712</td>
<td>0.1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.09683</td>
<td>0.06676</td>
<td>0.06631</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
<td>0.06563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>$\ell_p$-TTC</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>0.00554</td>
<td>0.00467</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>0.07285</td>
<td>0.05603</td>
<td>0.04588</td>
<td>0.03684</td>
<td>0.03274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILRTC</td>
<td>0.09082</td>
<td>0.1052</td>
<td>0.1162</td>
<td>0.13032</td>
<td>0.14733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaLRTC</td>
<td>0.08721</td>
<td>0.09933</td>
<td>0.11572</td>
<td>0.12963</td>
<td>0.14733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\ell_p$-PARAFAC</td>
<td>0.03399</td>
<td>0.03372</td>
<td>0.02323</td>
<td>0.02294</td>
<td>0.02279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l_p-TTC</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2dB</td>
<td>25.5332</td>
<td>0.8156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dB</td>
<td>25.9857</td>
<td>0.8337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4dB</td>
<td>26.1142</td>
<td>0.8381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dB</td>
<td>26.1566</td>
<td>0.8590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6dB</td>
<td>26.2133</td>
<td>0.8886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l_p-TTC</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2dB</td>
<td>25.7496</td>
<td>0.2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dB</td>
<td>25.8490</td>
<td>0.4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4dB</td>
<td>21.5425</td>
<td>0.5225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dB</td>
<td>21.9728</td>
<td>0.3816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6dB</td>
<td>22.7432</td>
<td>0.6132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l_p-TTC</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2dB</td>
<td>17.7496</td>
<td>0.2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dB</td>
<td>12.8591</td>
<td>0.0766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4dB</td>
<td>14.2347</td>
<td>0.1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dB</td>
<td>16.1879</td>
<td>0.2187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6dB</td>
<td>17.0601</td>
<td>0.2767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l_p-TTC</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2dB</td>
<td>12.5244</td>
<td>0.0708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dB</td>
<td>14.6430</td>
<td>0.1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4dB</td>
<td>16.1935</td>
<td>0.2781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dB</td>
<td>17.9288</td>
<td>0.4064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6dB</td>
<td>23.0132</td>
<td>0.5741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l_p-TTC</th>
<th>PSNR</th>
<th>SSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2dB</td>
<td>10.0141</td>
<td>0.4064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dB</td>
<td>11.8688</td>
<td>0.1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4dB</td>
<td>11.4637</td>
<td>0.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dB</td>
<td>11.5981</td>
<td>0.2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Windows, Pillars and Peppers. In addition, from the viewpoint of quantitative evaluation, a series of color images in Fig. 8 with different sizes are added into the simulation, and the results are tabulated in Table II. Consistent with the results in Table I, the proposed method also provides better performance in terms of MSE metric among all compared tensor completion approaches. We observe that TTC and $\ell_p$-PARAFAC achieve comparable performance but still are inferior to ours. On the other hand, from Fig. 7 and Table II, it is verified that the proposed method can achieve crystal clear image with strong structural integrity, and are showing good performance in terms of PSNR and MSE, respectively.

To further evaluate the robustness of the proposed method, we have conducted experiments on color image inpainting and denoising for different levels of impulsive noise, as tabulated in Table III. We observe that the proposed method achieves the best performance among all counterparts in terms of PSNR and SSIM metrics, which is consistent with our former analysis. The success of $\ell_p$-TTC is attributed to the $\ell_p$-regression...
for non-Gaussian distribution. Moreover, in Figs. 9 and 10, we compare our method with several competitors on the Yale Face dataset [51] and Flickr-Faces-HQ dataset [52], respectively, where 50% missing entries and 6 dB salt and pepper noise are added. Experimental results are presented, compared to other approaches, which vividly show the obtained image restored
by the proposed method can achieve crystal clear image in both subjective and objective metrics.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, a promising $\ell_p$-TTC method is proposed to recover the missing entries and suppress the outliers from tensorial data. Motivated by the tensor factorization, a factored form of TT-format representation is applied into $\ell_p$-regression minimization, which has the advantage of not requiring to pre-define the best user-defined weights in TT rank model. The proposed method succeeds to restore the target tensor from both missing entries and outliers corrupted observations. The effectiveness and superiority of the proposed scheme is verified by the applications of bistatic MIMO radar localization and
color image inpainting and denoising tests, from simulated to visual data, respectively. However, although the proposed method is empirically convergent, the theoretical analysis of convergence is still an open problem.
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