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Commonalities

- Goal: Recognize natural scene categories
- Extract features on images and learn models
- Test on database of scenes
- in general, accuracy or generality improves
Past theories

• Scene recognition based on
  - edges, surfaces, details
  - successive decision layers of increasing complexity
  - object recognition
Scene recognition may be initiated by low resolution global configuration

- enough information about meaning of scene in < 200ms [Potter 1975]
- understanding driven from arrangements of simple forms or “geons” [Biederman 1987]
- spatial relationship between blobs of specific size and aspect ratios [Schyns and Oliva 1994, 1997]
Modeling the Shape of the Scene: A Hollistic Representation of the Spatial Envelope
Aude Oliva and Antonio Torralba 2001
Shape of a scene

- Pose a scene as a SHAPE instead of a collection of objects
- Show scenes of same category have similar shape or spatial structure

[Image from Oliva and Torralba 2001]
Spatial Envelope

- Design experiment to identify meaningful *dimensions* of scene structure
- Split 81 pictures into groups then describe them

Used words like “man-made” vs “natural”, “open” vs “closed”
Spatial Envelope

- 5 Spatial Envelope Properties
  - Degree of Naturalness
  - Degree of Openness
  - Degree of Roughness
  - Degree of Expansion
  - Degree of Ruggedness

- Goal: to show these 5 qualities adequate to get high level description of scene
# Modeling Spatial Envelope

- Introduce 2nd order statistics based on Discrete Fourier Transform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Spectrum</th>
<th>Spectrogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>squared magnitude of FT = distribution of the signal’s energy among different spatial frequencies</td>
<td>spatial distribution of spectral information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT</td>
<td>Windowed DFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlocalized dominant structure</td>
<td>structural info in spatial arrangement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Good results
- More accurate

Both are high dimensional representation of scene Reduced by PCA to set of orthogonal functions with decorrelated coefficients
Energy Spectrum
Mean Spectrogram

- Structural aspects are modeled by energy spectrum and spectrogram

Mean spectrogram from hundreds of same category

[Image from Oliva and Torralba 2001]
Learning

• How can Spatial Envelope properties be estimated by global spectral features v?

• Simple linear regression
  
  • 500 images placed on axis of desired property
  
  • used for learning regression model parameters d

\[
\hat{s} = v^T d = \sum_{i=1}^{N_G} v_i d_i \\
= \int \int A(f_x, f_y)^2 \text{DST}(f_x, f_y) \, df_x \, df_y
\]

• s = amplitude spectrum * Discriminant Spectral Template (DST)

• Use regression for continuous features and binary features
• show how spectral components of energy spectrum should be weighted

• example: natural vs man-made
  • white: high degree of naturalness at low diagonal frequencies
  • black: low degree of naturalness at H and V frequencies
Naturalness

Value of naturalness = sum (Energy Spectra * DST)

Leads to 93.5% correct classification of 5000 test scenes
DST for other properties

Natural openness  Man-made openness  Natural ruggedness  Man-made expansion  ...
Categories

• Have *spectral energy model* for *spatial envelope features*

• Now need mapping of *spatial envelope features* to *categories*
Categories

Shows set of images projected into 2D space corresponding to openness and ruggedness.

Scenes close in the space have similar category membership.
Categories

• Projected typical exemplars of categories (coasts, mountains, tall buildings etc) into spatial envelope space to make database

• classification performed by K nearest neighbors classifier:
  - given new scene picture K-NN looks for K nearest neighbors of image within the labeled training dataset
  - these correspond to images with closest spatial envelope properties
  - category comes from most represented category of k images
Classification is on average 89% with WDST (86% with DST)
Accuracy

H - Highway
S - Street
C - Coast
T - Tall buildings

different categories lie on
different locations of the spatial
envelope axes
Summary

• find semantically meaningful spatial envelope properties

• show spatial properties strongly correlated with second order statistics DST and spatial arrangement of structures WDST

• spatial properties can be used to infer scene category
Summary

• find semantically meaningful spatial envelope properties

• show spatial properties strongly correlated with second order statistics DST and spatial arrangement of structures WDST

• spatial properties can be used to infer scene category
A Bayesian Hierarchical Model for Learning Natural Scene Categories
Li Fei Fei and Pietro Perona 2005
Overview

- **Goal:** Recognize natural scene categories

- **Insight:** use intermediate representation before classifying scenes
  - labeled wrt global or local properties
  - Oliva and Torralba - spatial envelope properties hand labeled by human observers

- **Problem with human labeling:** hours of manual labor and suboptimal labeling

- **Contribution:** unsupervised learning of themes
Overview

• **Inspiration: work on Texture models**
  - first learn dictionary of textons
  - each category of texture captures a specific distribution of textons
  - intermediate themes ~ texture descriptions

• **Approach: local regions clustered into themes, then into categories. Probability distribution learnt automatically, bypassing human annotation**
Learn Bayesian Model - requires learning joint probability of unknown variables

for new image, compute probability of each category given learned parameters

label is the category that gives the largest likelihood of the image

lots more math in the paper
Features

- previous model used global features (frequencies, edges, color histograms)
- They use LOCAL REGIONS
- Tried 4 ways of extracting patches
- Evenly sampled dense grid spaced 10x10 randomly sized patch between 10-30pxls
Codewords obtained from 650 training examples

learn codebook through k-means clustering. codewords are center of cluster

best results when using 174 codewords

Shown in descending order according to size of membership.

correspond to simple orientations, illumination patterns similar to ones that early human visual system responds to.
Testing

• Oliva and Torralba dataset with 5 new categories = 13 category dataset

• Model trained on 100 images of each category (10 mins to train all 13)

• New image labeled with category that gives highest likelihood probability
Results

Perfect confusion table would be straight diagonal

Chance would be 7.7% recognition

Results average 64% recognition

Recognition in top two choices 82%

Highest block of errors on indoor scenes

Figure 7. **Left Panel.** Confusion table of Theme Model 1 using 100 training and 50 test examples from each category, the grid detector and patch based representation. The average performance is 64.0%. **Right Panel.** Rank statistics of the confusion table, which shows the probability of a test scene correctly belong to one of the top $N$ most probable categories. $N$ ranges from 1 to 13.
Results

A look at the internal structure

Shows themes that are learned and corresponding codewords

Some themes have semantic meaning:
foliage (20, 3) and branch (19)
Results

Indoor scenes
Summary

- Automatically learn intermediate codewords and themes using Bayesian Model with no human annotation

- Obtain 64% accuracy of categorization on 15 category database, 74% accuracy on 4 categories
## Big Picture so far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># of categories</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of intermediate themes</strong></td>
<td>6 Spatial Envelope Properties</td>
<td>40 Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>training # per category</strong></td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>training requirements</strong></td>
<td>human annotation of 6 properties for thousands images</td>
<td>unsupervised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>performance</strong></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kind of features</strong></td>
<td>global statistics (energy spectra &amp; spectrogram)</td>
<td>Local patches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond Bags of Features: Spatial Pyramid Matching for Recognizing Natural Scene Categories
Labzebnik, Schmid, Ponce 2006
Overview

• **Goal:**
  Recognize photographs as a scene (forest, ocean) or as containing an object (bike, person)

• **Previous methods:**
  - Bag of features (disregard spatial information)
  - Generative part models and geometric correspondence (computational expensive)

• **Novel Approach:**
  - repeatedly subdivide image
  - compute histograms of local features over subregions
  - Adapted from Pyramid Matching [Grauman and Darrell]
Spatial Pyramid Matching

Constructing a 3-level pyramid.
- Subdivide image at three levels of resolution.
- For each level and each feature channel, count # features in each bin.
- The spatial histogram is a weighted sum of these values.
- Weight of match at each level is inversely proportional to size of bin
  penalize matches in larger cells
  highly weight matches in smaller cells
Features

• “weak” features
  - oriented edge points at 2 scales 8 orientations.
  - similar to gist

• “strong” features
  - SIFT descriptors of 16x16 patches over dense grid
  - cluster patches to form M=200 or M=400 large visual vocabulary
Testing

- **15 Category dataset - Scenes**
  [Oliva & Torralba and FeiFei and Perona]

- **Caltech 101 - objects**

- **Graz - objects**
Results on Scenes

- What does chart show?
- Multilevel pyramid setup better than single level
- For strong features, single level performance goes down from L=2 to L=3. Pyramid too finely subdivided. Even so, pyramid scheme stays same.
- Advantage: Pyramid combines multiple resolutions in principled fashion -- robust to failures at individual levels
- Strong features better than weak. But M=200 similar to M=400. Pyramid scheme more important than large vocabulary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L$</th>
<th>Weak features ($M = 16$)</th>
<th>Strong features ($M = 200$)</th>
<th>Strong features ($M = 400$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (1 × 1)</td>
<td>45.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>72.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>74.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (2 × 2)</td>
<td>53.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>77.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>78.8 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (4 × 4)</td>
<td>61.7 ± 0.6</td>
<td>79.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td><strong>81.1 ± 0.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (8 × 8)</td>
<td>63.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>77.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>80.7 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Classification results for the scene category database (see text). The highest results for each kind of feature are shown in bold.
Results on Scenes

Figure 3. Confusion table for the scene category dataset. Average classification rates for individual classes are listed along the diagonal. The entry in the $i$th row and $j$th column is the percentage of images from class $i$ that were misidentified as class $j$. 

indoor scenes

coast and open country
Results on Scenes

Retrieval from the scene category database

Spatial pyramid scheme successful at finding major elements, “blobs”, directionality of lines

Also preserves high frequency detail (see kitchen)
Results on Caltech 101

Will this method work on OBJECTS?

Figure 5. Caltech-101 results. Top: some classes on which our method ($L = 2, M = 200$) achieved high performance. Bottom: some classes on which our method performed poorly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak features</th>
<th>Strong features (200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.5 ±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.4 ±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.2 ±1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.2 ±0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Classification results for the Caltech-101 database.

This outperforms orderless methods and geometric correspondence methods.
Results on Graz

Will this method work on OBJECTS with lots of clutter?

Has images of bikes, persons, and backgrounds.

Images vary greatly within one category

Heavy clutter and pose changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>$L = 0$</th>
<th>$L = 2$</th>
<th>Opelt [14]</th>
<th>Zhang [25]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bikes</td>
<td>82.4 ±2.0</td>
<td>86.3 ±2.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>79.5 ±2.3</td>
<td>82.3 ±3.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Results of our method ($\bar{M} = 200$) for the Graz database and comparison with two existing methods.
Summary

- Approach: repeatedly subdivide image and computing histograms of image features over subregions.
- Shown good results on 3 datasets
- Simple global construction
## Big Picture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of categories</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of intermediate themes</td>
<td>6 Spatial Envelope Properties</td>
<td>40 Themes</td>
<td>M=200 strong feature clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training # per category</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training requirements</td>
<td>human annotation of 6 properties for thousands images</td>
<td>unsupervised</td>
<td>unsupervised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81% (on all 15 cat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of features</td>
<td>global statistics (energy spectra &amp; spectrogram)</td>
<td>Local patches</td>
<td>“weak” oriented filters “strong” SIFT features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what is novel</td>
<td>can use global features for recognition</td>
<td>human annotation not needed</td>
<td>spatial pyramid scheme robust to different resolutions * Add object detection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Results underscore surprising power of global statistics for scene categorization and even object recognition

• Can be used as “context modules” within larger object recognition systems