## Active Detection via Adaptive Submodularity

Yuxin Chen<sup>†</sup>, Hiroaki Shioi<sup>‡</sup>, Cesar Antonio Fuentes Montesinos<sup>†</sup> Lian Pin Koh<sup>†</sup>, Serge Wich<sup>¶</sup> and Andreas Krause<sup>†</sup>

ICML Beijing June 23, 2014







#### **Motivating Example: Biodiversity Monitoring**



## **Application: Detecting Orangutan nests**



#### Automatic, Open-loop Computer Vision System



#### Interactive Detection

#### How can human experts best help the detection task?





The adaptive policy

#### **Open-loop** (Passive) System

![](_page_5_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Closed-loop (Active) System

![](_page_5_Picture_3.jpeg)

## **Evidence for Detection**

![](_page_6_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Train classifier (e.g., SVM; conv. Neural Network, etc.) on 45 positive and 148 negative examples
- Use sliding window to produce "response images"
- Which detection should be proposed next?

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Votes and Hypotheses

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

Interactions between voting elements and hypotheses:  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ [Hough '59; Gall et al, '09; Barinova et al, '11]

## Active Detection as an Adaptive Optimization Problem

#### **Positive coverage:**

Votes can be fully explained /covered by a true hypotheses.

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

Assume that each vote carries unit weight

## Active Detection as an Adaptive Optimization Problem

#### **Negative coverage:**

Votes that are similar with false votes should be discounted.

![](_page_9_Figure_3.jpeg)

Assume that each vote carries unit weight

### The general case: Real-votes setting

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

Now observe that hypothesis 3 is false

Voting elements with real-value votes

#### Active Detection in a Nutshell

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **The Objective**

Coverage for edge (v,h) = Coverage due to positive observations + Coverage due to negative observations Coverage of  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}) = \sum_{(v,h)}$  Coverage for edge (v,h)

## **Diminishing Evidence in Detection**

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Positive observations explain "response" in local areas
- Negative observations explain "response" in similar areas

Adaptive submodular objective can capture this diminishing returns effect

## Adaptive Submodularity [Golovin & Krause, 2011]

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

Receiving observation earlier (i.e., at an ancestor) only increases its <u>expected</u> marginal benefit.

# Greedy vs. Optimal

Assume that:

- The optimal policy achieves a maximum coverage of Q
- The greedy policy achieves a maximum coverage of  $Q-\beta$

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

 $\leq \Big( \ln \frac{Q}{\beta} + 1 \Big) \cdot$ 

![](_page_14_Picture_6.jpeg)

Cost of the Greedy algorithm w.r.t. F

Cost of optimal policy

## **Detection Results**

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Active detection improves precision and recall

## **TUD-pedestrian: Pedestrian Detection**

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

## **Votes and Hypotheses** Hough-forest Based Detector

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

h2 6 4

Response Image Original Image [Hough-forest, Gall et al, CVPR'09]

# **TUD-pedestrian: Detection Results**

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

Cyan box: current detection. Red boxes: ground-truth labels of pedestrians. Green boxes: detections made by the active detector. <sup>19</sup>

#### PASCAL 2008 - Person Category Deformable Parts Model (DPM)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Conclusion

- An active detection framework that enables turning existing base detectors into systems that intelligently interact with users.
- We show that the objective function satisfies adaptive submodularity, allowing us to use efficient greedy algorithms, with strong theoretical guarantees.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of the active detection algorithm on three different real-world object detection tasks.

Come to our poster on Tuesday for more details !