

1 Discussion

In the following we will be discussing our procedure as well as our results. We will start off in Section 1.1, where we will be giving a brief summary of our obtained results from Section ??, ?? and ?. We will then in Section 1.2 compare our results with the results of Newell *et al.* [3] and Olsen [4], as well as discuss the differences in the results. In Section 1.3 we will argue and discuss the why the autoencoder improved our initial model. Lastly, we will in Section 1.4 comment on potential future work in relation to this project.

1.1 Summary of the Obtained Results

In Section ?? we successfully implemented and trained a Stacked hourglass, consisting of a single hourglass. We did this by following the configuration details described by Newell *et al.* [3] and Olsen [4]. The developed model has a validation PCK accuracy of 0.433 and a test PCK accuracy of 0.441.

In Section ?? we gained an understanding of how the developed model works by exploring the different components of the model. We could verify, that the skip-connections of the model were used for recreating details that are lost during the encoder-phase of the model, as argued by Newell *et al.* [3] and Olsen [4]. We then used PCA to gain an understanding of the structure of the latent space of the model. By doing so we came to the conclusion, that the model had learned the differences between people standing up and people sitting down, as well as possibly discovering some redundancy in the model, as principal component 50 and above seemed to act as noise. Lastly, we used clustering to gain an understanding of how the model works. By doing so we learned, that the model knows the difference between fully-annotated people and not-fully annotated people, as well as knows the difference between stationary people and moving people. Here we also identified some possible reasons for inaccuracies of the model, as these classifications were not always correct.

In Section ?? we used our knowledge of the model to improve the performance of the model. This was done by developing and training an autoencoder, which was placed in the model. We decided to make use of an autoencoder, as we knew from the previous section, that the latent space of the Stacked hourglass contained a lot of noise, as well as some missclassifications, which the autoencoder possibly could help on. By doing so, both the validation and test PCK accuracy increased to 0.467 and 0.473, respectively.

1.2 Comparison of Models

Description	# stacks	Testing accuracy
Olsen - 2A	2	0.72
Olsen - 2B	2	0.81
Olsen - 2M	2	0.83
Our SHG	1	0.469
Our modified SHG	1	0.576

Table 1: Comparison of our developed models with Olsens developed model [4]. The models have only been tested on fully-visible joints (that is, where $v = 2$)

To further understand the performance of our developed models, we have in Table 1 compared our models with the models developed by Olsen [4], which consisted of 2 stacks.

By looking at Table 1 we see, that the performances of the models developed by Olsen [4] exceeds the performances of our developed models. However, we also see, that all of Olsen’s [4] models use more stacks, than our models, which could explain the better performance. This is also argued by Newell *et al.*, as they describe how stacking multiple hourglasses, increases the performance of the model.

Another reasoning behind the loss of performance compared with the models developed by Olsen [4] is, that Olsen’s models were only trained on fully-visible joints [4], whereas our models were trained on both fully-visible joints and on non-visible joints. This could make Olsen’s models [4] perform better on fully-visible joints, as this probably makes the model more focused on learning fully-visible joints during training. We would thus argue, that if we were to retrain our models on only fully-visible joints, the gap between the performance of our models and Olsen’s models [4] would become smaller, and even very small in the case of the modified Stacked hourglass. This is however not possible to predict and thus only purely speculation, however, our thought experiment does support this claim.

Olsen’s models and data are more similar to ours, than the ones used by Newell *et al.* [3], making the comparison more accurate. However, we can still compare our results with the ones obtained by Newell *et al.* [3] to get a further performance evaluation of our models.

Like in our case, Newell *et al.* do also develop a model consisting of only a single hourglass. However, Newell *et al.* does not report the testing accuracy of this model. Instead, they report the evolution of the validation accuracy during training, for joints that are not associated with the head and torso. The validation accuracy seems to top at around 0.65 [3]. If we test our models on the joints from our testing data, that are not associated with the head or torso, we get a PCK accuracy of 0.253 and 0.3 for the standard Stacked hourglass and the modified Stacked hourglass, respectively.

There are a number of reasons that could explain the poor performance of our models compared with the models developed by Newell *et al.* [3].

1. We use a different dataset than Newell *et al.* [3]: Newell *et al.* uses the FLIC [5] and MPII Human Pose [1] datasets, whereas we use the 2017 Microsoft COCO dataset [2]. These datasets could potentially be different from the dataset that we use, making it an unfair comparison to compare our results with Newell *et al.*’s results [3]. For instance, the FLIC [5] and MPII Human Pose [1] could contain less occlusion than the Microsoft COCO dataset [2], which would decrease the performance of our model, as argued by Newell *et al.* [3].
2. We use a different PCK accuracy metric: Newell *et al.* state, that they use different PCK accuracy metrics - that is PCK accuracy metrics, where the normalization constant is different - at different times [3], however, they do not state which PCK accuracy metric they used for validation during training. We chose a normalization constant equal to one tenth of the heatmap size, however, if Newell *et al.* [3] used a greater normalization constant, the predictions would have a bigger probability of being accepted as correct, making the accuracy of the developed model seem greater than it actually is.
3. Newell *et al.* describes that they use batch normalizations to prevent the model from overfitting, however, they do not describe where they used these batch normalizations [3]. If we were to place our batch normalizations at places different than where Newell *et al.* [3] place theirs, we could make our model overfit much quicker than what Newell *et al.* [3] experiences, resulting in worse performance. This, however, is much less likely, as we decided to follow Olsen [4] for the placement of batch normalization and they

achieved great results, hinting towards their, and thus also our, placements of the batch normalizations being correct.

4. Our preprocessing of not-visible joints was different than the preprocessing done by Newell *et al.* [3]: when we preprocessed the data, we made use of a Gaussian filter to represent uncertainty in the annotation. For not-visible joints we used a standard deviation of 0.5, whereas we for visible joints used a standard deviation of 1. Newell *et al.* describes, how they for all joints used a standard deviation of 1 [3]. We decided to use a standard deviation of 0.5 for not-visible joints, as the uncertainty of the annotation of these joints is greater, than for visible joints. This could however also possibly have confused the model, as it thus implicitly also learns to predict whether a given joint is visible or not, making the complexity of the model greater, possibly decreasing the performance of the model.

Overall, the comparison between our developed model and the model developed by Newell *et al.* [3] is difficult, as they have a lot of differences. The comparison between our model and Olsen’s model [4] is thus more accurate, however, still inaccurate, as Olsen’s models use 2 stacks instead of just 1 as in our case [4].

1.3 Why did the Autoencoder Improve the Stacked hourglass?

In Section ?? we argued the following two reasons for why using the autoencoder could improve the performance of the model: (1) inconsistency of the placement of the training observations, and (2) having principal components that acts as noise. In the following we will be analysing and discussing our results of using the autoencoder, leading to if these two reasons actually had an effect on the performance of the model.

1.3.1 Clustering the Latent Space




Figure 1: Results of performing K -Means clustering on 10,000 random samples of the latent space of the autoencoder

In Figure 1 we have visualized the results of performing K -Means on the latent space of the autoencoder with $K = 2$. Due to memory limitations only 10,000 training samples were used.

In Figure ?? we visualized equivalent results of performing the same procedure on the latent space of the Stacked hourglass. In correlation to Figure ?? we argued, that the two clusters contained some missclassifications, which could explain the poor performance of the model. More specifically, *Cluster 1*, the cluster containing samples with a lot of keypoints missing, contained a lot of samples that should ideally have been in *Cluster 0*.

If we compare Figure 1 with Figure ?? we can see, that the clusters in Figure 1 contains fewer missclassifications than what was the case in ?. More specifically we can see, that *Cluster 0* in 1, the cluster containing samples with a lot of keypoints missing, contains fewer samples that should have been in *Cluster 1*, than what was the case earlier. Likewise, the distribution of the amount of samples in each cluster is also more balanced, leading to believe that fewer missclassifications are indeed happening.

On the other hand, the 10.000 samples used in Figure 1 and ?? are not the same. Both figures contains 10.000 random samples out of the total 124.040 samples, meaning the two figures most likely are not alike, however, probably have some overlap. This leads to us believe, that the two figures are not exactly comparable, however, will still give a decent insight into the clustering of the two latent spaces.

1.3.2 Removing Noisy Features from the Latent Space




Figure 2: Cummulative sum of the explained variance ratio per principal component of the latent space of the Stacked hourglass and autoencoder, respectively

In Section ?? we argued, that the latent space of the developed Stacked hourglass contained a lot of principal components that acted as noise. By using an autoencoder this noise should be removed, since the autoencoder learns the most important features of the input data, as the output of the autoencoder is only an approximation of the input.

In Figure 2 we have visualized the cummulative sum of the explained variance ratio per principal component of the latent space of the Stacked hourglass and the autoencoder for the training data. We can clearly see, how the autoencoder needs a lot less principal components to represent the data, than the Stacked hourglass. If we assume, that 5% of the data acts as noise, the autoencoder needs 16 principal components to explain the data, where the Stacked hourglass needs a total of 541. This means, that by using the autoencoder we have removed a lot of redundancy in the form of noise, essentially denoising the data, which could explain the improvement of the performance.

To sum up, it seems, that we by using the autoencoder in the Stacked hourglass, have improved the structure of the latent space of the model, as well as removed the noise of the latent space, which seems to have improved the performance, as argued in Section ??.

1.4 Future Work

If we were to work further with this project, it would be ideal to explore the effects of stacking multiple modified hourglasses end-to-end. By doing so we would not only hope that the performance of the model to increase further, but we would also hope we could obtain the same accuracy as Newell *et al.* experiences [3], however with fewer stacks. For instance, we could hope that by stacking 2 modified hourglasses, we would achieve the same results as Newell *et al.* achieves with 4 standard hourglasses.