


Lecture 14


Visual recognition



- Datasets
- 3D object detection

Lecture 14

Announcements




- Midterm review on Friday
- Midterm next Monday!
 - 3:00-4:20pm in this class room
 - Last year midterm is available!
 - Open notes/books but no electronics!

Caltech 101

[Learning generative visual models from few training examples: an incremental Bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories.](#) L. Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona. CVPR 2004, Workshop on Generative-Model Based Vision. 2004

- Pictures of objects belonging to 101 categories.
- About 40 to 800 images per category. Most categories have about 50 images.
- The size of each image is roughly 300 x 200 pixels.

Caltech 101 images



Caltech-101: Drawbacks

- Smallest category size is 31 images: $N_{train} \leq 30$
- Too easy?
 - left-right aligned
 - Rotation artifacts
 - Saturated performance



Caltech-256

Griffin, Gregory and Holub, Alex and Perona, Pietro (2007) *Caltech-256 Object Category Dataset*. California

- Smallest category size now 80 images
- About 30K images
- Harder
 - Not left-right aligned
 - No artifacts
 - More categories
- New and larger clutter category



Caltech 256 images

baseball-bat



dog



basketball-hoop



kayac



traffic light





J. Deng, et al. (2009-2016)


From prof. Li's group @ Stanford!

Largest dataset for object categories up to date

- ~20K categories;
- 14 million images;
- ~700im/categ;
- free to public at **www.image-net.org**

IMAGENET is a knowledge ontology

- Taxonomy



- S: (n) [Eskimo dog](#), [husky](#) (breed of heavy-coated Arctic sled dog)
 - [direct hypernym](#) / [inherited hypernym](#) / [sister term](#)
 - S: (n) [working dog](#) (any of several breeds of usually large powerful dogs bred to work as draft animals and guard and guide dogs)
 - S: (n) [dog](#), [domestic dog](#), [Canis familiaris](#) (a member of the genus *Canis* (probably descended from the common wolf) that has been domesticated by man since prehistoric times; occurs in many breeds) "the dog barked all night"
 - S: (n) [canine](#), [canid](#) (any of various fissiped mammals with nonretractile claws and typically long muzzles)
 - S: (n) [carnivore](#) (a terrestrial or aquatic flesh-eating mammal) "terrestrial carnivores have four or five clawed digits on each limb"
 - S: (n) [placental](#), [placental mammal](#), [eutherian](#), [eutherian mammal](#) (mammals having a placenta; all mammals except monotremes and marsupials)
 - S: (n) [mammal](#), [mammalian](#) (any warm-blooded vertebrate having the skin more or less covered with hair; young are born alive except for the small subclass of monotremes and nourished with milk)
 - S: (n) [vertebrate](#), [craniate](#) (animals having a bony or cartilaginous skeleton with a segmented spinal column and a large brain enclosed in a skull or cranium)
 - S: (n) [chordate](#) (any animal of the phylum Chordata having a notochord or spinal column)
 - S: (n) [animal](#), [animate being](#), [beast](#), [brute](#), [creature](#), [fauna](#) (a living organism characterized by voluntary movement)
 - S: (n) [organism](#), [being](#) (a living thing that has (or can develop) the ability to act or function independently)
 - S: (n) [living thing](#), [animate thing](#) (a living (or once living) entity)
 - S: (n) [whole](#), [unit](#) (an assemblage of parts that is regarded as a single entity) "how big is that part compared to the whole?", "the team is a unit"
 - S: (n) [object](#), [physical object](#) (a tangible and visible entity; an entity that can cast a shadow) "it was full of rackets, balls and other objects"
 - S: (n) [physical entity](#) (an entity that has physical existence)
 - S: (n) [entity](#) (that which is perceived or known or inferred to have its own distinct existence (living or nonliving))

The PASCAL Visual Object Classes (VOC) Dataset and Challenge (2005-2012)

Mark Everingham

Luc Van Gool

Chris Williams


John Winn

Andrew Zisserman



Dataset Content

- 20 classes: aeroplane, bicycle, boat, bottle, bus, car, cat, chair, cow, dining table, dog, horse, motorbike, person, potted plant, sheep, train, TV
- Real images downloaded from flickr, not filtered for “quality”



- Complex scenes, scale, pose, lighting, occlusion, ...

Annotations


- Complete annotation of all objects
- Annotated in one session with written guidelines

Occluded

Object is significantly occluded within BB

Truncated

Object extends beyond BB



Difficult


Not scored in evaluation

Pose

Facing left

Examples


Aeroplane




Bicycle




Bird





Boat



Bottle




Bus




Car



Cat



Chair




Cow



A red double-decker bus is parked at a transit center. A sign on the left reads "CARDWELL TRANSIT CENTRE". A yellow sign above the bus says "busTrans".



A photograph of a dog lying on its side on a light-colored bed. The dog has a black and white skull-and-crossbones pattern on its head. Two yellow rectangular boxes are overlaid on the image: one box encloses the dog's head and upper front paws, and another box encloses the dog's lower front paws. In the top left corner, there is a small inset image showing a close-up of a chair leg and footrest, with the text "sheetFunc" above it. In the top right corner, there is another small inset image showing a red chair, with the text "otherFunc" above it.



History



	Images	Objects	Classes	Notes
2005	2,232	2,871	4	<i>Collection of existing and some new data.</i>
2006	5,304	9,507	10	<i>Completely new dataset from flickr (+MSRC)</i>
2007	9,963	24,640	20	<i>Increased classes to 20. Introduced tasters.</i>
2008	8,776	20,739	20	<i>Added “occlusion” flag.”</i>
				
2012	11,530	27,450	20	<i>Added segmentation masks</i>

- Challenge: annotation of test set is withheld until after challenge


PASCAL 3D+

Xiang, Mottaghi, Savarese (2014)

- 12 rigid categories from PASCAL VOC are annotated with 3D pose and aligned with 3D cad models
- Benchmark for continuous 3D pose estimation and shape recovery of object categories



PASCAL 3D+



ShapeNet3D

Chang, et al., (2015)




- Covers 55 common object categories with about 51,300 unique 3D models.
- 12 object categories of PASCAL 3D+

ObjectNet3D

Xiang, et al., (2016)

- ~100 rigid categories from ImageNet and PASCAL
 - Annotated with 3D pose and aligned with 3D cad models from ShapeNet



OpenSurfaces

Bell et al., 2014-2015

Materials



Reflectances



Textures



+80K annotated images of materials


Scene understanding

LabelMe, Russell et al., 2005



3D scene understanding

Stanford 2D-3D-Semantics Dataset, Armeni et al., 2016



<http://buildingparser.stanford.edu/dataset.html>


MSR COCO dataset

Lin et al 2014-2016

- Dataset for image recognition, segmentation, and captioning

- Features:


- Object segmentation
- Recognition in Context
- Multiple objects per image
- More than 300,000 images
- More than 2 Million instances
- 80 object categories
- 5 captions per image



Visual genome

Krishna et al.2015- 2016
From prof. Li's group @ Stanford!

Knowledge-based dataset that connects structured image concepts to language



108,249 Images

4.2 Million Region Descriptions

1.7 Million Visual Question Answers

2.1 Million Object Instances

1.8 Million Attributes

1.8 Million Relationships

More Datasets....

ESP

[Ahn et al, 2006]

LabelMe

[Russell et al, 2005]

TinyImage

Torralba et al. 2007

Lotus Hill


[Yao et al, 2007]

MSRC

[Shotton et al. 2006]



More Datasets....



UIUC Cars (2004)

S. Agarwal, A. Awan, D. Roth



CMU/VASC Faces (1998)

H. Rowley, S. Baluja, T. Kanade



FERET Faces (1998)

P. Phillips, H. Wechsler, J. Huang, P. Raus



COIL Objects (1996)

S. Nene, S. Nayar, H. Murase




MNIST digits (1998-10)

Y LeCun & C. Cortes



KTH human action (2004)

I. Lepetev & B. Caputo




Sign Language (2008)

P. Buehler, M. Everingham, A. Zisserman



Segmentation (2001)

D. Martin, C. Fowlkes, D. Tal, J. Malik.




3D Textures (2005)

S. Lazebnik, C. Schmid, J. Ponce




CuRRET Textures (1999)

K. Dana B. Van Ginneken S. Nayar J. Koenderink



CAVIAR Tracking (2005)

R. Fisher, J. Santos-Victor J. Crowley



Middlebury Stereo (2002)

D. Scharstein R. Szeliski

Lecture 14

Visual recognition




- 3D object detection
 - Introduction
 - Single instance 3D object detectors
 - Generic 3D object detectors

3D object detection




Properties of a 3D object detector




- Detect objects under generic view points
- Estimate object pose & 3D shape

Properties of a 3D object detector




- Detect objects under generic view points
- Estimate object pose & 3D shape
- Work at different levels of specificity

Properties of a 3D object detector




- Detect objects under generic view points
- Estimate object pose & 3D shape
- Work at different levels of specificity
- Limited amount of supervision


Models for 3d Object detection




Models for 3d Object detection




Models for 3d Object detection




Models for 3d Object detection



Models for 3d Object detection



Models for 3d Object detection




Single 3D object recognition




Single 3D object recognition




1963: Block world




(a) Original picture.



(b) Computer display of picture
(reflected by mistake).



(c) Differentiated picture.






(d) Feature points selected.



Larry Roberts
39

80s: First 3D object detectors



- Marr '78, '82
- Ballard, '81
- Grimson & L.-Perez, '87
- Lowe, '87
- Forsyth et al. '91
- Edelman et al. '91
- Ullman & Barsi, '91
- Rothwell '92
- Linderberg, '94
- Murase & Nayar '94

Key Challenges

Variability due to:

- View point
- Illumination
- Occlusions
- Arbitrary texture



NOTE: intra-class variability doesn't need to be modeled

Modern 3D object recognition

- Rothganger et al. '04, '06
- Brown et al, '05
- Lowe '99, '04
- Ferrari et al. '04, '06
- Lazebnick et al '04
- Hsiao et al., '11-14
- Lim et al., '13-16


Recognition paradigm:

Hypothesis generation & validation

Object representation: 2D or 3D location of key points

Affine Harris-Laplace detector

Courtesy of Rothganger et al.



- x,y
- Scale
- Orientation

Key idea: use scale and orientation to normalize descriptors

Why it is useful to normalize descriptors?

View 1



Rectification



SIFT

View 2



Rectification



SIFT

It helps feature matching!

Basic scheme

- Representation

 - Features

 - 2D/3D Geometrical constraints

- Model learning

- Recognition


 - hypothesis generation

 - validation

Model learning

Build a 3D model:

- N images of object from N different views
- Extract key points from each view
- Match key points between 2 views
- Use affine structure from motion to compute:
 - Keypoints 3D location and orientation
 - Camera locations from 2 views
- Find connected components
- Use bundle adjustment to refine the model
- Upgrade model to Euclidean assuming zero skew and square pixels




Learnt models

x,y,z +

h,v +

SIFT descriptor



Courtesy of Rothganger et al

Basic scheme

- Representation

- Features

- 2D/3D Geometrical constraints

- Model learning

- Recognition [object instance from object model]

- hypothesis generation

- Model verification

Recognition

Goal: given a query image I , detect object instance and estimate its pose

Equivalent to: from a collection of learnt object models, find object model that fits object in image

Equivalent to a fitting problem!


- Generate hypothesis
- Verify hypothesis
- Select hypothesis with lowest fitting error
- Generate recognition results

2D model detection


Goal: given a query image I , find object model that matches with I

Model: collection of points on planar surface

query




Model 1



Model 2

2D model detection


- Find matches between “model” points and “query” points
- Using N matches to fit homographic transformation
- If matches and selected model are correct, the fitting error is small



2D model detection

- Find matches between “model” points and “query” points
- Using N matches to fit homographic transformation
- If matches and selected model are correct, the fitting error is small

query



- Generate hypothesis
- Verify hypothesis
- Select hypothesis with lowest fitting error
- Generate recognition results


Verification: The hypothesis generates ***high*** fitting error

Model 2

2D model detection

- Find matches between “model” points and “query” points
- Using N matches to fit homographic transformation
- If matches and selected model are correct, the fitting error is small

query



- Generate hypothesis
- Verify hypothesis
- Select hypothesis with lowest fitting error
- Generate recognition results




Verification: The hypothesis generates **low** fitting error


Model 2

2D model detection

- Find matches between “model” points and “query” points
- Using N matches to fit homographic transformation
- If matches and selected model are correct, the fitting error is small



RANSAC!




Sample set = set of points in 2D

Algorithm:

1. Select random sample of minimum required size to fit model [?] =[2]
 2. Compute a putative model from sample set
 3. Compute the set of inliers to this model from whole data set
- Repeat 1-3 until model with the most inliers over all samples is found

RANSAC!




Sample set = set of points in 2D

$$|O| = 14$$

Algorithm:

1. Select random sample of minimum required size to fit model [?] =[2]
 2. Compute a putative model from sample set
 3. Compute the set of inliers to this model from whole data set
- Repeat 1-3 until model with the most inliers over all samples is found

RANSAC!




Algorithm:

1. Select random sample of minimum required size to fit model [?]
 2. Compute a putative model from sample set
 3. Compute the set of inliers to this model from whole data set
- Repeat 1-3 until model with the most inliers over all samples is found

Recognition


Class: apple



1. Find matches between model and test image features
2. Generate hypothesis:
 - Compute transformation $p = M P$, from N matches

Recognition

Class: apple




$$p = M P$$

1. Find matches between model and test image features
2. Generate hypothesis:
 - Compute transformation $p = M P$, from N matches

($N=2$, if affine camera & affine key points)

Recognition


Class: apple



1. Find matches between model and test image features
2. Generate hypothesis:
 - Compute transformation $p = \mathbf{M} P$, from N matches $(N=2, \text{ if affine camera \& affine key points})$
 - Generate hypothesis of object location and pose w.r.t. camera

Recognition


Class: apple



1. Find matches between model and test image features
2. Generate hypothesis:
 - Compute transformation $p = \mathbf{M} P$, from N matches (N=2, if affine camera & affine key points)
→ Generate hypothesis of object location and pose w.r.t. camera
3. Model verification
 - Use **M** to project other 3D model features into test image
 - Compute residual = D(projections, measurements)

Recognition

Class: apple



4. Repeat steps 2 and 3 until residual doesn't decrease anymore
5. Repeat steps 1-4 for different object instance C (apple, teddy bear, etc...)
6. M and C corresponding to min residual return the estimated object pose and object instance

Object to recognize




Initial matches based
on appearance



Matches verified with
geometrical constraints



Recovered pose




Courtesy of Rothganger et al

Detection and pose estimations results

“apple” model




“shoe” model



Test image



Test image



Courtesy of Rothganger et al

- Handle severe clutter

3D object detectors

Lowe. '99, '04



- Handle severe occlusions
- Fast!

Courtesy of D. Lowe

Detecting food in your kitchen!




Edward Hsiao, Alvaro Collet and Martial Hebert. **Making specific features less discriminative to improve point-based 3D object recognition.** *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June, 2010.

Hsiao, Alvaro Collet and Martial Hebert, **Occlusion Reasoning for Object Detection under Arbitrary Viewpoint**, PAMI 2014



Detecting IKEA furniture!


Parsing IKEA Objects: Fine Pose Estimation. Joseph Lim, Hamed Pirsiavash, and Antonio Torralba. International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), 2013.




Visual search and landmarks recognition



Google Goggles



Visual search and landmarks recognition



RICOH

A9


Limitations of single instance 3D object detectors

- Cannot handle intra-class variability.

Why?


- Models capture fine-grained details of the object instance which are not shared across instances in the same class
- Hypothesis-generation and verification scheme is not designed to maximize discrimination power

Models for 3d Object detection




Mixture of 2D models

- Weber et al. '00
- Schneiderman et al. '01
- Ullman et al. '02
- Fergus et al. '03
- Torralba et al. '03
- Felzenszwalb & Huttenlocher '03
- Leibe et al. '04
- Shotton et al. '05
- Grauman et al. '05
- Savarese et al, '06
- Todorovic et al. '06
- Vedaldi & Soatto '08
- Zhu et al 08
- Gu & Ren, '10




CONS: Single view models are independent • Non scalable to large number of categories/view-points • Just b. boxes • Cannot estimate 3D pose or 3D layout

Models for 3d Object detection



2D ½ implicit models



- Savarese & Fei-Fei, ICCV 07
- Savarese & Fei-Fei, ICCV 07
- Su, Sun, Fei-Fei, Savarese., CVPR 2009
- Sun, Su, Fei-Fei, Savarese, ICCV 2009
- Thomas et al. '06-'09
- Kushal, et al., '07
- Farhadi '09
- Zhu et al. '09
- Ozuysal et al. '10
- Stark et al.'10
- Payet & Todorovic, 11
- Glasner et al., '11



- Parts relationship can be probabilistic and learnt automatically



Linking features or parts across views:

Perspective or affine transformation constraints



$$x' = H x$$

Linking features or parts across views: Epipolar Transformation Constraints




$$I' = F^T x$$

$$x' \in I'$$

Implicit 3D models – built upon the ISM


- Thomas et al. '06
- Leibe et al. '04



- Sparse set of interest points or parts of the objects are linked across views.
- These links are used to transfer votes across views
- Each detected codeword votes for the object centroid within nearby views

Implicit 3D models – graph-based representations


Savarese, Fei-Fei, ICCV 07
Sun, et al, CVPR 2009, ICCV 09



- Canonical parts captures view invariant diagnostic appearance information
- 2d $\frac{1}{2}$ structure linking parts via weak geometry
- Parts and relationship are modeled in a probabilistic fashion
- Semi-supervised: only class labels, not view point or part annotations


Examples of learnt part-based models

Car



Examples of learnt part-based models


Travel iron



Experimental results


- Object detection from any viewing angles
- Accurate estimation of the object pose
- Synthesis of object appearance from unseen view points

Object detection and pose estimation




3D object dataset, 2007

Object detection and pose estimation



Synthesizing novel views

S. M. Seitz and C. R. Dyer, *Proc. SIGGRAPH 96*, 1996, 21-30



Predicting object appearance from novel views



Affine
transformation



Learnt model




Learnt model




PROS: Flexible and easy to learn • Enable unsupervised discovery of parts
CONS: Limited accuracy • Unable to model part configurations in 3D

Models for 3d Object detection



3D explicit models

- Sun, Xu, Bradski, Savarese, ECCV 2010
- Sun, Kumar, Bradski, Savarese, 3DIM-PVT 2011
- Kumar, Sun, Savarese, CVPR 12
- Xiang & Savarese, CVPR 12
- Hoiem, et al. , '07
- Chiu et al . '07
- Liebelt et al. '08, 10
- Xiao et al . '08
- Yi et al 09
- Arie-Nachimson & Barsi '09
- Sandhu et al . '09
- Hu & Zhu '10




3D explicit models

Yan, et al. '07







3D explicit models

Xiang & Savarese, 2012
Pepik et al. 2013






3D object detectors



3D object dataset [Savarese & Fei-Fei, ICCV 07]


3D object detectors



ImageNet dataset [Deng et al. 2010]

3D object detectors

- Part localization on the 3DObject dataset



PROS: Large discrimination power; Able to capture part configurations in 3D
CONS: Require more supervision; slow...

Next lecture

- 3D scene understanding

Agenda on recognition

Classification (images; areas)

- bag of words
- Pyramid matching

Detection (use slides with 3 axis: category; supervision; 3D info. Use intro job talk)


- Template based (holistic; part based)
- Multi-view (single instance; categories; 3D pose)

Scene understanding

- Segmentation (bottom up; semantic)
- 3D scene understanding



Activity understanding

Parameterization on view-sphere



- Model the object as collection of parts for any T and S on the viewing sphere

Multi-view generative part-based model



- Learning: estimate the latent variables and relevant parameters, given the observations
- Variational EM can be used

Blei, ICML 2004.

α = Part Prop. Prior

$\pi \sim Dir(\alpha)$

$R \sim Mult(\pi)$


$Y_n \sim Mult(\eta)$

η = Part Appearance


$X_n \sim N(theta)$

θ = Part Location/shape

Yn=Codeword
Xn=Location



Incorporating geometrical constraints




Within triangle constraints:

$$M_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot m^i \approx m^j$$

Encoded as a penalty term
in variational EM

Incorporating geometrical constraints



View morphing constraints:

Seitz & Dyer SIGGRAPH 96
Xiao & Shah CVIU '04


$$m(S) = \sum_{g=1}^3 m_T^g \cdot s_g$$

$$W(S) = \sum_{g=1}^3 W_T^g \cdot s_g$$


Encoded as a penalty term
in variational EM

Incorporating geometrical constraints

S. M. Seitz and C. R. Dyer, *Proc. SIGGRAPH 96*, 1996, 21-30




Semi-supervised




- Class label
- Object bounding box
- No part labels
- No pose labels [unlike Sun CVPR 09]
- No need to observe same object instance from multiple views [unlike Savarese & Fei-Fei, 07, 08]

Incremental learning




- Enable unorganized and on-line collection training images
- Increase efficiency in learning (no need large storage space)

Incremental learning



- Assign new training image to a triangle of the view sphere
- Evidence of training image is used to update model parameters
- Re-estimate sufficient statistics in a iterative fashion

Evolution of learnt parts



Part Evolution

3D object detectors

- Best results up-to-date in pose estimation and 3D part estimation

Cars from 3D Object dataset [Savarese 07]	Method	ours	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
	Viewpoint (cars)	93.4 %	85.4	85.3	81	70	67	48.5

Cars from EPFL dataset [Ozuysal 09]	Method	ours	Ours - baseline	DPM [7]	[8]
	Viewpoint (cars)	64.3%	58.1	56.6	41.6

Chairs, tables and beds from IMAGE NET [Deng et al. CVPR09]	Method	ours	Ours - baseline	DPM [7]
	Viewpoint	63.4%	34.0	49.5

[1] N. Payet and S. Todorovic. From contours to 3d object detection and pose estimation. In ICCV, 2011.

[2] D. Glasner, M. Galun, S. Alpert, R. Basri, and G. Shakhnarovich. Viewpoint-aware object detection and pose estimation. In ICCV, 2011.

[3] M. Stark, M. Goesele, and B. Schiele. Back to the future: Learning shape models from 3d cad data. In BMVC, 2010.

[4] J. Liebelt and C. Schmid. Multi-view object class detection with a 3D geometric model. In CVPR, 2010.

[5] H. Su, M. Sun, L. Fei-Fei, and S. Savarese. Learning a dense multiview representation for detection, viewpoint classification. In ICCV, 2009.

[6] M. Arie-Nachimson and R. Basri. Constructing implicit 3d shape models for pose estimation. In ICCV, 2009.

[7] P. Felzenszwalb, R. Girshick, D. McAllester, and D. Ramanan. Object detection with discriminatively trained part-based models. TPAMI, 2010.

[8] M. Ozuysal, V. Lepetit, and P. Fua. Pose estimation for category specific multiview object localization. In CVPR, 2009.

3D object detectors

- Part localization on the 3DObject dataset

