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Prototypical Types of Tasks

Problems related to automatic analysis of complex data such as text, photographs, videos, and n-dimensional medical images can be categorized into these prototypical tasks:

- **Classification.** Recognizing type or category of a scene captured in a photograph, output is a discrete, categorical label.

- **Regression.** Predicting the price of a house as a function of its distance from a good school; output is a continuous variable.

- **Density estimation.** Learning a probability density function for healthy individual scans to detect abnormalities.

- **Manifold learning.** Capturing intrinsic variability of size and shape of different structures in human brain from MRIs.
Prototypical Types of Tasks

- **Semi-supervised.** Interactive image segmentation, for example, where user’s brush strokes define labeled data and other pixels provide already available unlabeled data.

- **Active learning.** Learning a general rule for detecting tumors using only a few manual annotations, input mostly unlabeled.

What follows is a unified model of decision forests that can be used in all of these prototypical learning tasks. Can implement and optimize inference algorithms once and use them in many applications.
Review: Decision Tree Basics

A decision tree is a set of questions organized in a hierarchical manner and represented graphically as a tree.

- To estimate an unknown property of an input object, the tree asks successive questions about its known properties. Each question depends on the answers to the previous questions — represented as a path through the tree. The terminal node on the path determines the decision.

- Requires (1) tests associated to internal nodes and (2) decision-making predictors associated with each leaf.

In general, decision trees can be compared to splitting complex problems into sets of simpler ones with a hierarchical model. Model parameters can be selected by hand (simple) or learned from data.
Review: Decision Tree Basics

Left: general decision tree structure. Right: a decision tree for determining whether a photo was taken indoors or outdoors.
Notation

Definition (Data points and features)

A generic object, called a *data point*, is denoted by a vector \( \mathbf{v} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathcal{F} \) where the components \( x_i \) represent some attributes of the data point called *features*.

Features vary between applications; for computer vision \( \mathbf{v} \) may correspond to a pixel in an image and \( x_i \) may represent responses of a chosen filter bank at that location.
Motivation and Review
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Testing and Training
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Notation example. Input is collected in $d$-dimensional space. Testing is done by each node on $\mathbf{v}$, which is sent to child node. Training involves sending all training data $S_0$ into the tree and optimizing the split node parameters over an energy function. (Criminsì 2012)
Notation

- Number of features depends on the type of data point and application.
- Dimensionality of feature space $\mathcal{F} = d$ can be large, even infinite, so we extract a small portion of $d$ features as we need them.

**Definition (Features of interest)**

Define $\phi(v) = (x_{\phi_1}, x_{\phi_2}, \ldots, x_{\phi_{d'}}) \in \mathcal{F}^{d'} \subset \mathcal{F}$ as the selected subset of features where $d'$ denotes the dimensionality of the subspace and $\phi_i \in [1, d]$ denote the selected dimensions.

We usually choose a subspace $\mathcal{F}^{d'}$ that is much smaller than the original ($d' \ll d$).
Notation

Test functions, split functions, weak learners

We use the terms “test function,” “split function,” and “weak learner” interchangeably.

Definition (Test function)

A test function at split node $j$ is a function

$$h(v, \theta_j) : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\},$$

where 0 and 1 can be interpreted as false or true respectively, and $\theta_j \in \mathcal{T}$ denote the parameters of the test function at the $j$th split node.

A data point $v$ arriving at $j$ is sent to its left or right child according to the result of $j$’s test function.
Notation

Training points and training sets

- A *training point* is a data point for which the attributes that we are seeking for are actually known. For example, a set of photos with “indoor” or “outdoor” labels.

- A *training set* $S_0$ is a collection of different training points.

- In supervised tasks, a training point is a pair $(v, y)$ where $v$ is the input feature vector and $y$ represents a generic, known label.

- In unsupervised tasks, a training point is represented by its feature response and it has no associated label.
Decision tree testing

Decision trees are separated into an offline training phase and an online testing phase.

(Criminsi 2012)

**Testing**

A new data point $\mathbf{v}$ starts at the root and makes it way down to a leaf node, which contains uses a predictor to construct an output (label or continuous value) for $\mathbf{v}$. 
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Decision tree training

Training

Selects the type and parameters of the test function $h(v, \theta_j)$ associated with each split node $j$ by optimizing a chosen objective function defined on the training set.

- At each node $j$ with input $S_j$, learn the function that “best” splits $S_j$ into $S_j^R$ and $S_j^L$.
- Do this by maximizing an objective function.

(Criminsin 2012)
The objective function at node $j$, in general, is defined as

$$\theta_j^* = \arg\max_{\theta_j \in \mathcal{T}} I_j \quad (1)$$

where

$$I_j = I(S_j, S_j^L, S_j^R, \theta_j)$$

$$S_j^L = \{(v, y) \in S_j \mid h(v, \theta) = 0\}$$

$$S_j^R = \{(v, y) \in S_j \mid h(v, \theta_j) = 1\}$$

$I_j$ captures some notion of information gain from the split while the second two equations state that data points on which $h$ evaluates to 0 go left and to 1 go right.
We need some way to know when to stop the training algorithm.

- Can stop when the tree has some maximum number of levels $D$.
- Can also stop when we reach some minimum value of $\max_{\theta_j} l_j$, which is when the attributes that we care about in the leaf nodes are similar to one another.
- Can stop growing tree when a node contains too few training points.

Stopping criteria prevent overfitting and loss of generalization power.
Consider a geometric parameterization for split functions, with a weak learner model formulated as $\theta = (\phi, \psi, \tau)$ where:

- $\psi$ defines the geometric primitive used to separate the data (e.g. axis-aligned hyperplane, oblique hyperplane, general surface).
- $\tau$ is a parameter vector that captures thresholds for inequalities used in the binary test.
- $\phi$ is a filter function that selects features from input vector $\mathbf{v}$.

We perform the optimization from equation (1) over these subparameters.
A simple parameterization is the linear model

\[ h(\mathbf{v}, \theta_j) = [\tau_1 > \phi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \psi > \tau_2] \]  

(2)

where \([\cdot]\) is the indicator function.

- In 2D, \(\phi(\mathbf{v}) = (x_1, x_2, 1)^T\) and \(\psi \in \mathbb{R}^3\) denote a generic line in homogenous coordinates.

- Setting \(\tau_1 = \infty\) or \(\tau_2 = -\infty\) corresponds to using a single inequality test function.

- Lines \(\psi\) aligned with an axes of the feature space (e.g. \(\psi = (1, 0, \psi_3)\) or \(\psi = (0, 1, \psi_3)\)) are often used in boosting and are referred to as stumps.

Axis aligned vs general line (Criminsin 2012)
Linear and Nonlinear Data Separation

We can replace hyperplanes with surfaces that have more degrees of freedom. In 2D we can use conic sections with

\[ h(\mathbf{v}, \theta_j) = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 > \phi^T(\mathbf{v}) \psi \phi(\mathbf{v}) > \tau_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3) \]

with \( \psi \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \) representing the conic section in homogenous coordinates.

Remark

*Low dimensional weak learners can be used for high dimensional data because the selector \( \phi_j \) can select a small set of features for different nodes.*
By training objective functions, we reduce uncertainty using the concepts of *entropy* and *information gain*. We can quantify the intuition of uncertainty reduction with measures for entropy and information gain.

**Shannon entropy**

For discrete probability distributions we typically use Shannon entropy.

\[ H(S) = - \sum_{c \in C} p(c) \log(p(c)) \]  

(4)

where \( S \) is the set of training points and \( c \) indicates the class label. \( C \) denotes the set of all classes and \( p(c) \) is the empirical distribution extracted from the training points in \( S \).
Improvements from decision tree splits can be quantified by measuring information gain

\[
I = H(S) - \sum_{i \in \{L, R\}} \frac{|S^i|}{|S|} H(S^i)
\]  

(5)

Remark

Maximizing information gain gives us split parameters which produce the highest confidence in the final distributions.
Energy Models (discrete)

Example

Information gain from axis aligned discrete splits (Criminisi 2012)
Energy Models (continuous)

Entropy

We can also define entropy and information gain for continuous labels and distributions.

Differential entropy

In place of the Shannon entropy, we use differential entropy

\[ H(S) = - \int_{y \in Y} p(y) \log(p(y)) \, dy \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where \( y \) is a continuous label and \( p \) is the probability density function estimated from the training points in \( S \).
Energy Models (continuous)

Gaussian-based models are often used to approximate $p(y)$ because of their simplicity. The differential entropy of a $d$-variate Gaussian is

$$H(S) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e)^d |\Lambda(S)| \right]$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

where $\Lambda(S)$ is the covariance matrix of the training set.

**Remark**

*Information gain (5) can be defined the same way in continuous models as discrete models because of the flexibility of its definition.*
Energy Models (continuous)

Example

Information gain from Gaussian model (Criminsi 2012)
Leaf Prediction Models

After training, each leaf is associated with a subset of the labeled training data.

- A test point traverses the tree until it reaches a leaf, and we generate a label for that point using the test statistics gathered in that leaf.
- In general, leaf statistics can be captured with posterior distributions

\[ p(c \mid \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad p(y \mid \mathbf{v}) \tag{8} \]

where \( c \) and \( y \) represent categorical (discrete) or continuous labels and \( \mathbf{v} \) is the data point being tested. Conditioning denotes the fact that the distributions depend on the specific leaf node reached by \( \mathbf{v} \).
We can do a maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate with

\[ c^* = \arg \max_c p(c | \mathbf{v}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

in the discrete case. In general, however, keeping the entire distribution around lets us reason about uncertainties better.
Randomness Model

During training, we inject randomness into trees in order to give the trained trees better generalization power. Two popular ways to do this are:

1. Random training set sampling (bagging). This typically yields good training efficiency.

2. Randomized node optimization. This enables us to train trees on the entire training data and yields margin-maximization properties for ensemble models.

These two methods can be used together.
Randomness Model

Randomized node optimization

In the optimization equation (1), we optimize with respect to the entire parameter space $\mathcal{T}$. For large dimensional problems, it can be infeasible to optimize over $\mathcal{T}$.

**Idea**

At node $j$, use a small random subset $\mathcal{T}_j \subset \mathcal{T}$ of parameter values, optimizing

$$\theta_j^* = \arg \max_{\theta_j \in \mathcal{T}_j} l_j$$

(10)

The amount of randomness is controlled by $|\mathcal{T}_j|/|\mathcal{T}|$. We can define $\rho = |\mathcal{T}_j|$ so that when $\rho = |\mathcal{T}|$ there is no randomness and when $\rho = 1$ we have maximum randomness and no optimization.
Random Decision Forests

A random decision forest is an ensemble of randomly trained decision trees.

**Key aspect**

The component trees in a random forest model are all randomly different from one another, which decorrelates individual tree predictions and results in improved generalization and robustness.

**Forest properties**

The weak learners, energy model, leaf predictors, and types of randomness in its component trees influence the prediction and estimation properties in a forest.
The randomness parameter $\rho = |T_j|$ controls the correlation between trees in a forest.

Randomness control in forest (Criminsi 2012)
Random Decision Forests
Training and prediction

Notation
In a forest with $T$ trees, we use $t \in 1, \ldots, T$ to index component trees.

- Component trees are trained individually — this can be done in parallel.
- A test point $\mathbf{v}$ is simultaneously passed through all trees until it reaches the leaves — can also be done in parallel.
Random Decision Forests
Training and prediction

We can combine all tree predictions into a forest prediction in multiple ways. For classification, we can use a simple average

\[
p(c \mid \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} p_t(c \mid \mathbf{v}) \tag{11}\]

where \( p_t(c \mid \mathbf{v}) \) represents the posterior distribution found in the leaf of the \( t \)th tree. We can also multiply tree outputs together

\[
p(c \mid \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{t=1}^{T} p_t(c \mid \mathbf{v}) \tag{12}\]

where the partition function \( Z \) ensures probabilistic normalization.
Random Decision Forests

Example

Forest ensemble model (Criminsi 2012)
Key Parameters

The parameter models that most influence decision forest behavior:

- Maximum allowed tree depth $D$. Very deep trees can lead to overfitting.

- Amount of randomness (controlled by $\rho$) and its type. Randomness affects tree correlation and generalization properties.

- Forest size (number of trees) $T$. Testing accuracy generally increases as $T$ increases, but training time also increases.

- Choice of weak learner model

- Training objective function

- Choice of features in practical applications
Random Forest Specializations

The generic decision forest model we just defined can be applied to various specific tasks:

- Classification forests
- Regression forests
- Density estimation forests
- Manifold forests
- Semi-supervised forests
- Random ferns and other variants

Each of the above models can be defined with slight modifications and specifications on top of the random forest framework. If interested, see the original paper in the references.
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Abstract

- A simple and effective way to integrate structural information in random forests
  - Available topological distribution of object classes
  - Coherently labelled regions

- Contents:
  - Augmentation of random forests and structured label information
  - A novel data-splitting function
    ✓ Joint distributions
    ✓ Learning typical label transitions between object classes
  - Two possibilities for integrating the structured output predictions into semantic labeling
Introduction and Motivation

- Great attention on the field of visual object classification
  - Object detection
  - Classification
  - Tracking
  - Action recognition

- Supervised learning algorithms for semantic image labelling
  - Large amount of densely labelled training data

- Structured information
  - A typical street:
    - Road, car, bicyclist, etc.
Introduction and Motivation

- Goal of structured learning:
  - Providing ideas to take this form of additional, structural information into account in learning process
    - Fitting to the needs of semantic image labelling/segmentation
  - Example: Street scene
    - A car should be driving on a road, but not on top of a building

- State-of-the-art approaches:
  - Using Complementary features at different levels within random field models

- Structural information is mostly incorporated on the highest, semantic level
Features

**Low level**
- Mostly calculated on a per-pixel basis
- Incorporate local color or texture statistics

**Mid level**
- Operating on regions or super-pixels
- Providing shape, continuity or symmetry information

**High level**
- Introducing global image statistics on the image level
- Providing information about inter-object or contextual relations
- Seeking for proper scene configurations
Introduction and Motivation

- At this paper:
  - Simple, effective way for incorporating structural information in the popular random forest
  - Competitive to the other state-of-the-art learning techniques
    - Boosting
    - SVM
  - A novel way for incorporating joint statistics about the local label neighborhood
    - Learning typical labelling transitions among object class categories
    - Disadvantage of standard classification:
      - Can only deal with a single (atomic) label per training sample
      - Meaningless label configurations
  - CamVid and MSRCv2 databases
Introduction and Motivation

Fig. 1. Training data example
Advantages and Disadvantages

**Advantages**

1. Including the label topology in the training stage
   - respecting the label configurations observed during training

2. Avoiding assigning implausible label transitions

**Disadvantages:**

- Need for densely labelled training data
- Shared problem with state-of-the-art image labelling algorithms
- The results of experiments on MSRCv2:
  - Well handled Non-completely labelled training data
Randomized Decision Forests

- Extremely fast for training and classification
- Can be easily parallelized
- Inherently multi-class capable
- Tending not to over-fit
- Robust to label noise

Fig. 2. Binary decision forest: Ensemble of binary decision trees, mitigate the risk of over-fitting
Randomized Decision Forests

- A (binary) decision tree:
  - Tree-structured classifier
  - Making a prediction by routing a feature sample $x \in \chi$ through the tree to the leaf
  - A node $ND(\psi, t_l, t_r) \in \mathbb{T}$

Binary split function

\[
\psi(x): \chi \rightarrow \{0,1\}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi(x) = 0 & \rightarrow t_l \\
\psi(x) = 1 & \rightarrow t_r
\end{align*}
\]

- A leaf:

\[
LF(\pi) \in \mathbb{T}
\]

- The simplest form of a decision tree
- Able to cast a class prediction $\pi \in \Upsilon$ for any sample it is reached by
Class Prediction

- For a sample \( x \in \chi \)
  - Recursively branching the sample down the tree until a leaf is reached
  - Tree prediction function:

\[
h(x|t) : \chi \rightarrow \Upsilon \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}
\]

\[
h(x|\text{ND}(\psi, t_l, t_r)) = \begin{cases} 
  h(x|t_l) & \text{if } \psi(x) = 0 \\
  h(x|t_r) & \text{if } \psi(x) = 1
\end{cases}
\]

\[
h(x|\text{LF}(\pi)) = \pi
\]

- Forest F prediction function: Majority of the votes

\[
y^* = \arg\max_{y \in \Upsilon} \sum_{t \in F} \left[ h(x|t) = y \right] \quad (1)
\]

Iverson bracket
Randomized Training

- Extremely randomized trees algorithm
  - Independent training
  - On a random subset of the training set $D \subseteq \chi \times \Upsilon$
  - Recursive learning procedure
  - If $|D| < \text{minimum size or } E(D) < \text{threshold}$
    - $LF(\pi), \pi: \text{the most represented class in } D$
      \[
      \pi \in \arg\max_{\pi \in \Upsilon} \sum_{(x,y) \in D} [y = z]
      \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)
  - Else: $ND(\psi, t_l, t_r)$ is grown
    - $\Psi$: a test function selected from a randomly generated set $\Psi$
      - Maximizing the expected information gain about the label distribution due to the split $\{D_l^\psi, D_r^\psi\}$ of the training data
Randomized Training

\[ \psi = \arg\max_{\psi' \in \Psi} \{ E(D) - E(D; \psi') \} = \arg\min_{\psi' \in \Psi} E(D; \psi') \]

\[ = \arg\min_{\psi' \in \Psi} \left\{ \frac{|D_l\psi'|}{|D|} E\left( D_l\psi' \right) + \frac{|D_r\psi'|}{|D|} E\left( D_r\psi' \right) \right\} \]

- \( t_l \) and \( t_r \):
  - Recursively grown with their respective training data \( D_l\psi \) and \( D_r\psi \)

- Unbalanced training data case:
  - Weighting each label \( z \in \Upsilon \) according to the inverse class frequencies observed in the training data \( D \)
    \[\sum_{(x,y) \in D} [y = z]^{-1}\]
  - Considering in the computation of the expected information gain
    ✓ Reducing the class average prediction error
Random Forests in Computer Vision

- Classification tasks in the image domain
  - Anchoring the feature space to a pixel grid topology
  - Trained on a specific feature space $\chi$
    - Extracted set of $d \times d$ patches from multi-channel images $I$
    - Channels: Including color features such as gradients, filter banks, etc.
  - A multi-channel training image:
    - 3D matrix $I$
    - $I_{(u,v,c)}$: the value at pixel $(u, v)$ and channel $c$
  - A patch:
    - A triple $(u, v, I) \in \chi$
      - Coordinate $(u, v)$ of the patch center in image $I$
  - The label space:
    - $\gamma = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$: set of $k$ object classes
Most Common Used Test Functions

\[
\psi^{(1)}(x|\theta_1, \tau) = \left[ I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_1 > \tau \right],
\]
\[
\psi^{(2)}(x|\theta_1, \theta_2, \tau) = \left[ I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_1 - I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_2 > \tau \right],
\]
\[
\psi^{(3)}(x|\theta_1, \theta_2, \tau) = \left[ I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_1 + I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_2 > \tau \right],
\]
\[
\psi^{(4)}(x|\theta_1, \theta_2, \tau) = \left[ |I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_1 - I_{(u,v,0)} + \theta_2| > \tau \right],
\]

- \(\theta_i = (\delta u_i, \delta v_i, c_i), \quad i = 1,2\)
  - Displacement parameters relative to the patch center
  - Indexing a point in the patch
- \(\tau \in \mathbb{R} : \) Threshold
Test

• Random forest $F$ has been trained

• Classification of a test image:
  ▪ Labelling each pixel with the most probable class predicted by the forest, centered on the $d \times d$ patch
Structured Learning in Random Forest

- Input data in Traditional approaches
  - Assigned to single, *atomic* class labels
  - Acting as arbitrary identifiers
  - Without any dependencies among them
  - Quite noisy results

- Many computer vision problems
  - Limited model
    - Inherently topological structure
    - Rendering the class labels explicitly interdependent
    - Awareness of the local topological structure
Structured Label Space

- \( P = \gamma^{d' \times d'} \)
  - Consists of \( d' \times d' \) pixels
  - Patches of object class labels
  - \( p_{ij} \in \gamma \): \( ij^{th} \) entry of the label patch \( p \)
  - \textit{index} \((0,0)\): Central position
  - \textit{Feature patch} \( x \in \chi \) and \textit{label patch} \( p \in P \)
  - Association of \( x = (u, v, I) \) and \( p \)
    - \( p \): Holding the labels of all pixels of image \( I \) within a \( d' \times d' \) neighborhood of \((u, v)\)
    - \( p_{ij} \): Label of pixel \((u + i, v + j)\)
      - Note: \( d \) (size of feature patch) may differ from \( d' \) (size of label patch)
  - Training patches: \( D \subseteq \chi \times P \)
Structured Label Space

- $P_t \subseteq P$: Set of label patches used to grow the leaf $t$
- The class label $\pi$
  - Parametrizing the leaf
  - A structured label of size $d' \times d'$ from $P$
  - Not just an atomic label from $\Upsilon$
  - Joint distribution of the label patches

- Low complexity for this step:
  - Pixel independent assumption

\[
\Pr(p|P_t) = \prod_{i,j} \Pr^{(i,j)}(p_{ij}|P_t) \quad (3)
\]

\[
\pi = \arg\max_{p \in P_t} \Pr(p|P_t) \quad (4)
\]
Structured Label Space

Fig. 2. Examples of object class segmentation using unary classifiers. Best viewed in color.
Structured Label Space

Selection of $\pi$ is based on joint probability

Fig. 3. Label patches reaching a leaf during training
Test Function Selection for Structured Labels

- Adaptation of the test function selection

- Naïve approach:
  - Porting the test selection criterion used in the standard random forest to our context
  - Simply associating each patch with the label we find in the center of the associated label patch $p$
  - Disadvantage: Like traditional random forest

- Clever approach
  - Selection based on the information gain with respect to a two-label joint distribution
  - Associating $(x, p)$ with two labels:
    ✓ First: Provided by $p_{00}$
    ✓ Second: Provided by $p_{ij}$, position has been uniformly drawn
  - Advantage:
    ✓ All entries of a label patch have the chance to influence the way a feature patch is branched
  ✓ Disadvantage:
    ✓ Increased complexity ($|Y|^2$ elements)
Solving the drawback:

• Considering a different test function selection method

  ✓ Associating each training pair with just one label $p_{ij}$
    - All entries of the label patch still influence the learning procedure
    - At lower computational cost
Structured Label Predictions

- Gathering from the trees of a forest
  - Combining into single label patch prediction

- $F$: A trained forest
- $x = (u, v, I)$: a test patch
- $P_F$: Set of predictions for $x$ gathered from each tree $t \in F$
  \[ P_F = \{ h(x|t) \in P : t \in F \} \tag{5} \]
- The label patch prediction for feature patch $x$
  \[ p^* = \underset{p \in P_F}{\arg \max} \Pr(p|P_F), \tag{6} \]
Structured Label Predictions

Fig. 4. Prediction of the structured label of a feature patch in a random forest.
Simple Fusion of Structured Predictions

- \( p \in P \): Patch label predicted for pixel \((u, v)\)
  - \((u + i, v + j)\) could be classified as \(p_{ij} \in \Upsilon\)
  - Collecting \(d' \times d'\) class predictions
    - Have to be integrated into single class prediction
    - Simple way: Selecting the most voted class per pixel

- Outcome of fusion step: labeling \( l \subseteq L \)
  - \(l_{uv} \in \Upsilon\): The class label associated with pixel \((u, v)\)
Simple Fusion of Structured Predictions

Fig. 5. Fusion of structured prediction
Optimizing the Label Patch Selection

- Different and more principled approach to the computation of the final labeling
  - Optimizing the label patch selection with respect to a given labelling

- **Agreement** of an individual label patch $p$:
  - Located at $(i, j) \in I$
  - With a given labeling $l \subseteq L$
  - $z \in Z_I$: An assignment of label patches to pixels in $I$
    
    √ $z_{uv} \in P_F$: Label patch for pixel $(u, v)$

    $$\varphi^{(i,j)}(p, l) = \sum_{(u,v)\in I} [p_{(u-i)(v-j)} = l_{uv}]. \quad (7)$$
Optimizing the Label Patch Selection

- **Total agreement:**

  \[ \Phi(z, l) = \sum_{(u,v) \in I} \phi^{(u,v)}(z_{uv}, l). \quad (8) \]

- Finding the label patch configuration that leads to the maximum total agreement with the labelling of a test image

  \[ (z^*, l^*) \in \arg\max\{\Phi(z, l)|(z, l) \in Z_I \times L\}. \quad (9) \]

- Solve: iterative optimization method
  - Selecting the best agreement label patch per pixel
  - Producing a new labeling
Experiments

- CamVid and MSRCv2 databases
  - CamVid: 11 classes
    - ROAD, BUILDING, SKY, TREE, SIDEWALK, CAR, COLUMN POLE, SIGN-SYMBOL, FENCE, PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLIST

- 24 × 24 feature patch

- 10 trees

- 500 iterations

- Stop rule: Less than 5 samples per leaf available
1. CamVid Experiments

Fig. 6. Illustration of feature patches with corresponding label patches, collected from different leaf nodes when trained on CamVid database. Bottom rows: Label sets and associated colors.
# 1. CamVid Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Avg(Class)</th>
<th>Avg(Pascal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF using Motion and Structure cues [9]</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF + CRF</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Structure + Simple Fusion)</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Full + Simple Fusion)</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Full + Optimized Selection)</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Classification results of CamVid database for label patch size $13 \times 13$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Avg(Class)</th>
<th>Avg(Pascal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF + CRF</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Structure + Simple Fusion)</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Full + Simple Fusion)</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our method (Full + Optimized Selection)</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Classification results of CamVid database for label patch size $11 \times 11$
Influence of the Patch Size

Fig. 7. Classification results of CamVid database as a function of the label patch size using Simple Fusion.
2. MSRCv2 Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Avg(Class)</th>
<th>Avg(Pascal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texton forests naïve (supervised) [26]</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF using covariance features [14]</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Baseline RF + CRF</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our method (Structure + Simple Fusion)</strong></td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our method (Full + Simple Fusion)</strong></td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our method (Full + Optimized Selection)</strong></td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Classification results of MSRCv2 database for label patch size 11 × 11
2. MSRCv2 Experiments

Fig. 8. Qualitative labelling results on images of the MSRCv2 database. Top row: Original images with ground truth annotations. Second row: Labelling using our baseline random forest classifier. Third row: Full + Simple Fusion. Last row: Full + Optimized Selection.
Conclusion

- Simple and effective way for semantic image labelling
  - Integrating ideas from structured learning into random forest framework
  - Incorporating the topology of the local label neighborhood in training process
  - Using topological joint label statistics of the training data in the node split functions

- Two possibilities for fusing the structured label predictions
  - Using overlapping predictions
  - Selecting most compatible label patches in the neighborhood
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Create *segmentation map* – segment membership for each pixel.

Or label each pixel, whether it contains edge or not – *edge map*.
Approach

- Random forest: train a bunch of trees on random samples and features, and then somehow combine their predictions.

- Training data consists of pairs of patches with corresponding segmentation masks (or edge maps).

  ✓ Can store any structured output in leaf nodes.
  ✓ Fast training and prediction, easy parallelization.

  ➢ Need a way of comparing structured labels.

  ❄ Big test limitation: unable to synthesize novel labels, only labels observed in training can be predicted.
Problem formalization

- Image is divided into patches of size 32x32.
- Predict 16x16 segmentation mask (or edge map) for every patch.

- Training data consists of pairs of patches with corresponding segmentation masks (or edge maps).

PAMI 2015 paper of the same authors.
32 x 32 image patch.

- Augmented by additional channels:
  - 3 color (CIE-LUV)
  - 2 gradient magnitude
  - 8 gradient orientation

\[ x \in R^{32 \times 32 \times 13} \]
Input features

- Two types of features are used:
  - Pixel lookups $x(i, j, k)$
  - Pairwise differences $x(i_1, i_1, k) - x(i_2, i_2, k)$
- Total number of features per patch after downsampling and blurring:
  - $16 \cdot 16 \cdot 13 + \binom{5}{2} \cdot 13 = 7228$
Output

- Output is structured: \( y = 16 \times 16 \) segmentation map (or edge map).
- We want to use standard information gain criteria based on Shannon entropy or Gini impurity.

Need to efficiently estimate similarities between segmentation masks (structured labels).

1. Transformation \( \Pi: Y \rightarrow Z \). Similarity defined in \( Z \).
2. Map structured labels \( y \in Y \) into discrete set of labels \( c \in C = \{1, \ldots, k\} \), such that labels with similar \( z \) have the same \( c \).
Mapping to $Z$

- Transformation $\Pi: Y \rightarrow Z$.
- Compare pairs of pixels from two segmentation masks.
- Too many $\Rightarrow$ use sampling of $m = 256$ pixels (empirically tested).

✓ This also injects additional randomness into the learning process, helping with trees diversity.
Mapping to discrete labels

- Map \( z \) to \( c \) (discrete label), two options:
  a) Cluster \( z \) into \( k \) clusters using K-means.
  b) Top \( \log_2 k \) PCA dimensions, assign according to orthant.
    - Both perform similarly.
    - After experimentation, they use PCA and \( k = 2 \).
Now we have the ability to cluster our training data.

Standard splitting criteria can be used:

\[ I_j = H(S_j) - \sum_{k \in \{L,R\}} \frac{|S_j^k|}{|S_j|} H(S_j^k) \]

\[ H(S) = -\sum_y p_y \log p_y \] (Shannon entropy)

OR

\[ H(S) = \sum_y p_y (1 - p_y) \] (Gini impurity)
Ensembling model

- For edge maps: just average of tree predictions.
  - Use stride of 2 => each pixel receives \( \frac{256T}{4} = 64T \) predictions.
  - To decorrelate predictions, train 2T total trees and evaluate an alternating set of T trees at each adjacent location.

- For segmentation mask: select y whose z is medoid (minimizes the sum of distances to all other z’s).
Multiscale detection

- Run this structured edge detector on original, half, and double resolution of input image.
- Average results after resizing to original resolution.
- Improves edge quality.
Parameters

- Image and label patch size.
- Channels and feature parameters (e.g. blurring).
- Decision forests parameters (stopping criteria, number of trees $T$, mapping parameters $m$ and $k$).
- Each tree is trained on one million randomly selected patches.
Results

- Accuracy measures:
  - fixed contour threshold (ODS), per-image best threshold (OIS), and average precision (AP).
- Standard non-maximal suppression technique applied to obtain thinned edges.
- Two datasets:
  - Berkeley Segmentation Dataset and Benchmark (BSDS 500).
  - NYU Depth dataset (v2), contains depth => 11 additional channels are used.
Fig. 4. Visualizations of matches and errors of SE+MS+SH compared to BSDS ground truth edges. Edges are thickened to two pixels for better visibility; the color coding is green= true positive, blue=false positive, red=false negative. Results are shown at three thresholds: high precision (T≈.26, P≈.88, R≈.50), ODS threshold (T≈.14, P=R≈.75), and high recall (T≈.05, P≈.50, R≈.93).
The dataset contains 200 training, 100 validation and 200 testing images.

PAMI 2015 paper of the same authors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ODS</th>
<th>OIS</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>FPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canny</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felz-Hutt [11]</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidayat-Green [16]</td>
<td>.62†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL [9]</td>
<td>.66†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gPb + GPU [6]</td>
<td>.70†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/2†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gPb [1]</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gPb-owt-ucm [1]</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketch tokens [21]</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG [31]</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1/280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-SS, T=1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-SS, T=4</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-MS, T=4</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Edge detection results on BSDS500 [1]. Our Structured Edge (SE) detector achieves top performance on BSDS while being 1-4 orders of magnitude faster than methods of comparable accuracy. Three variants of SE are shown utilizing either single (SS) or multiscale (MS) detection with variable number of evaluated trees $T$. SE-SS, $T = 4$ achieves nearly identical accuracy as gPb-owt-ucm [1] but is dramatically faster. [†Indicates results were measured on BSDS300; ‡indicates a GPU implementation.]
The NYU Depth dataset (v2) contains 1,449 pairs of RGB and depth images with corresponding semantic segmentations.

- Image size 320x240.
- 11 additional channels due to depth.

**NYU Depth dataset (v2)**

- Depth only
- RGB only
- RGB+depth

PAMI 2015 paper of the same authors
NYU Depth dataset (v2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ODS</th>
<th>OIS</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>FPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gPb [1] (rgb)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG [31] (rgb)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1/280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-SS (rgb)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-MS (rgb)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gPb [1] (depth)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG [31] (depth)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1/280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-SS (depth)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-MS (depth)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gPb [1] (rgbd)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1/240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG [31] (rgbd)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1/280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-SS (rgbd)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-MS (rgbd)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Edge detection results on the NYU Depth dataset [33] for RGB-only (top), depth-only (middle), and RGBD (bottom). Across all modalities on all measures SE outperforms both gPb and SCG while running 3 orders of magnitude faster.
Cross-dataset generalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Combination</th>
<th>ODS</th>
<th>OIS</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>FPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSDS / BSDS</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU / BSDS</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSDS / NYU</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU / NYU</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Cross-dataset generalization for Structured Edges. TRAIN/TEST indicates the training/testing dataset used. Our approach exhibits strong cross-dataset generalization, a critical component for widespread applicability.
Conclusions

- State-of-the-art accuracies.
- Real-time frame rates.
- Can be useful for time sensitive object recognition.
Deep Neural Decision Forests
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DNN + decision forests

Figure 2. Illustration how to implement a deep neural decision forest (dNDF). Top: Deep CNN with variable number of layers, subsumed via parameters $\Theta$. FC block: Fully Connected layer used to provide functions $f_n(\cdot; \Theta)$ (here: inner products), described in Equ. (3). Each output of $f_n$ is brought in correspondence with a split node in a tree, eventually producing the routing (split) decisions $d_n(x) = \sigma(f_n(x))$. The order of the assignments of output units to decision nodes can be arbitrary (the one we show allows a simple visualization). The circles at bottom correspond to leaf nodes, holding probability distributions $\pi_\ell$ as a result from solving the convex optimization problem defined in Equ. (10).
Training

- Defined a new stochastic, differentiable framework for decision trees.
- Can be solved through SGD.
- Train iteratively simultaneously with NN.

Algorithm 1 Learning trees by back-propagation

Require: \( \mathcal{T} \): training set, nEpochs
1: random initialization of \( \Theta \)
2: for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\text{Epochs}\} \) do
3: \quad Compute \( \pi \) by iterating (11)
4: \quad break \( \mathcal{T} \) into a set of random mini-batches
5: \quad for all \( B \): mini-batch from \( \mathcal{T} \) do
6: \quad \quad Update \( \Theta \) by SGD step in (7)
7: \quad end for
8: end for
Most impressive result

Authors modified GoogleNet and used in their dNDF.