Learning Equivariant Structured Output SVM Regressors

by Vedaldi, Blaschko, Zisserman. ICCV 2011. Interpreted by Magnus Burenius, KTH.

Invariance to Transformations

 Pose-invariant classification. Recognize an object category *regardless* of the object translation, rotation, and scale.



• **Pose regression.** Detect an object and estimate its translation, rotation, and scale.



 Detection. Find an object location (center), without estimating its orientation and scale.



Invariance and Equivariance

- Consider some transformation, like rotation.
- We would like object classification to be invariant to rotation.
- We would like object detection to be equivariant to rotation.



The Problem

- Input space: X
- Output space: Y
- Consider a transformation t acting on the input and output:

$$t = (t_X, t_Y) \in T$$
$$t_X \colon X \to X$$
$$t_Y \colon Y \to Y$$

• We want to learn a predictor f(x,w) that is invariant or equivariant to the transformation t:

$$f(t_X x; w) = f(x; w) \quad invariance \ (t_y = I)$$

$$f(t_X x; w) = t_Y f(x; w) \quad equivariance$$

The Problem

 Most of the time we do not have enough training data, representing all possible transformations.

One Approach

- Can generate more training data by transforming the original data.
- How many samples should be generated? How densely? What samples are relevant?

Another Approach

- Could explicitly model and estimate transformations as latent variables.
- Learning problem becomes non-convex.
 Inference might be slower.

Their Approach

- Generalize Structured SVM to incorporate invariance and equivariance into a convex training procedure.
- Removes the need for ad-hoc sampling strategies. Only generates the virtual samples that are necessary.
- Inference does not require the estimate of latent variables.

Toy Example

Assuming rotation invariance

$$X = R^2$$

$$Y = \{r, g, b\}$$



Gradually enforce invariance to larger rotations \rightarrow

• Let X and Y be the input and output and let $\Omega_{\rm X}$ and $\Omega_{\rm Y}$ be their sample spaces. These can be ANY spaces, not just integers or real vector spaces.

 A feature function Ψ is used to map a pair from these complicated spaces to something we can compute with:

$$\Psi: \Omega_X \times \Omega_Y \to R^d$$

- A classifier described by a vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ predicts a class by solving

$$f(x;\omega) = \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \omega \cdot \Psi(x,y)$$

- This imposes a restriction on $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$

During training the STRUCTURE of the output space is taking into account by defining a loss function

 $\Delta: \Omega_Y \times \Omega_Y \to R$

which quantifies the loss of predicting y_p when the true output is y. It should fulfill

$$\Delta(y, y_p) \ge 0$$

$$\Delta(y, y_p) = 0 \quad iff \quad y = y_p$$

 Δ should thus reflect the quantity which measures how well the classifier performs.

• Given a training set $(x_1, y_1)...(x_N, y_N)$ of **"only positives"** and a regularization constant C a classifier ω is trained by solving the convex optimization problem:

$$\min_{\omega} \|\omega\|^2 + C \sum_{n} \max_{y} (\Delta(y_n, y) + \omega \cdot \Psi(x_n, y) - \omega \cdot \Psi(x_n, y_n))$$

Search for difficult classifications

Their Generalization of S-SVM

Standard S-SVM:

$$\min_{\omega} \|\omega\|^2 + C \sum_{n} \max_{y} (\Delta(y_n, y) + \omega \cdot \Psi(x_n, y) - \omega \cdot \Psi(x_n, y_n))$$

Transformation equivariant generalization:

$$\min_{\omega} \|\omega\|^2 + C \sum_{n} \max_{y,t} (\Delta(t, y_n, y) + \omega \cdot \Psi(t_X x_n, y) - \omega \cdot \Psi(t_X x_n, t_Y y_n))$$

When looking for the difficult classifications we search over all possible equivariant variations of input and output.

Training

- The problem can be optimized using standard S-SVM solvers.
- These solvers handle the large number of constraints by generating the necessary ones on the fly.
- This corresponds to generating relevant virtual training data.

Advantages

- Principled approach to the generation of relevant virtual training data.
- Training is convex and no more expensive than standard Structured SVM and latent SVM.
- Inference is faster than latent SVM, since the latent variable, corresponding to the transformation, is not estimated.

Experiment 1 Rotation Equivariant Object Detection

- Let Φ(x,y) be the HOG-descriptor of a block of 7x7 HOG-cells at position y in the image x.
- A linear HOG model is not sufficient to capture arbitrary object rotations.
- They use something they call "slot kernel".
- The cluster the HOG-space into Q=18 clusters.
- The total feature function is the outer product:

$$\Psi(x, y) = \phi(x, y) e_{q(\phi(x, y))}^{T}$$



Experiment 1 - Results

Aerial car detection. 30 images having a total of 1000 cars with different rotations. Unclear division of training and test data.





Motion as Natural Transformations

- Consider pedestrian detection in video.
- Training data consists of many sequences of moving persons.
- The frames from the same sequence are highly correlated.
- This breaks the assumption of i.i.d. samples, which is fundamental for most machine learning methods.



Motion as Natural Transformations

 Consider a sequence as a single training sample, and the different frames in it as transformations of it.



Experiment 2 Pedestrian Classification

- DaimlerChrysler pedestrian classification benchmark. The training data consists of 800 positive images and 5000 negative images, and two test sets of the same size.
- Consider mirroring and translation by 1 pixel as transformations.
- Also consider motion as natural transformations.
- They derive and compare an invariant binary SVM and an invariant rank SVM.

Experiment 2







Conclusion

 The authors propose the use of their algorithm instead of ad-hoc sampling strategies or latent variables to incorporate invariance and equivariance.

