

# From Image-level to Pixel-level Labeling with Convolutional Networks

Pedro O. Pinheiro<sup>1,2</sup>

Ronan Collobert<sup>1,3,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Idiap Research Institute, Martigny, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Facebook AI Research, Menlo Park, CA, USA

pedro@opinheiro.com

ronan@collobert.com

## Abstract

We are interested in inferring object segmentation by leveraging only object class information, and by considering only minimal priors on the object segmentation task. This problem could be viewed as a kind of weakly supervised segmentation task, and naturally fits the Multiple Instance Learning (MIL) framework: every training image is known to have (or not) at least one pixel corresponding to the image class label, and the segmentation task can be rewritten as inferring the pixels belonging to the class of the object (given one image, and its object class). We propose a Convolutional Neural Network-based model, which is constrained during training to put more weight on pixels which are important for classifying the image. We show that at test time, the model has learned to discriminate the right pixels well enough, such that it performs very well on an existing segmentation benchmark, by adding only few smoothing priors. Our system is trained using a subset of the Imagenet dataset and the segmentation experiments are performed on the challenging Pascal VOC dataset (with no fine-tuning of the model on Pascal VOC). Our model beats the state of the art results in weakly supervised object segmentation task by a large margin. We also compare the performance of our model with state of the art fully-supervised segmentation approaches.

## 1. Introduction

Object segmentation is a computer vision tasks which consists in assigning an object class to sets of pixels in an image. This task is extremely challenging, as each object in the world generates an infinite number of images with variations in position, pose, lightning, texture, geometrical form and background. Natural image segmentation systems

<sup>†</sup>All research was conducted at the Idiap Research Institute, before Ronan Collobert joined Facebook AI Research.




Figure 1: **A schematic illustration of our method.** *Top:* (1) The model is trained using weakly annotated data (only image-level class information) from Imagenet. (2) The CNN generates feature planes. (3) These planes pass through an aggregation layer to constrain the model to put more weight on the right pixels. (4) The system is trained by classifying the correct image-level label. *Bottom:* During test time, the aggregation layer is removed and the CNN densely classifies every pixel of the image (considering only few segmentation priors).

have to cope with these variations, while being limited in the amount of available training data. Increasing computing power, and recent releases of reasonably large segmentation datasets such as Pascal VOC [7] have nevertheless made the segmentation task a reality.

We rely on Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [13], an important class of algorithms which have been shown to be state-of-the-art on large object recognition tasks [12, 24], as well as on fully supervised segmentation task [8]. One advantage of CNNs is that they learn sufficiently general features, and therefore they can excel

in transfer learning: *e.g.* CNN models trained on the Imagenet classification database [6] could be exploited for different vision tasks [10, 11, 20]. Their main disadvantage, however, is the need of a large number of fully-labeled dataset for training. Given that classification labels are much more abundant than segmentation labels, it is natural to find a bridge between classification and segmentation, which would transfer efficiently learned features from one task to the other one.

Our CNN-based model is not trained with segmentation labels, nor bounding box annotations. Instead, we only consider a single object class label for a given image, and the model is constrained to put more weight on important pixels for classification. This approach can be seen as an instance of Multiple Instance Learning (MIL) [14]. In this context, every image is known to have (or not) – through the image class label – one or several pixels matching the class label. However, the positions of these pixels are unknown, and have to be inferred.

Because of computing power limitations, we built our model over the *Overfeat* feature extractor, developed by Sermanet *et al.* [21]. This feature extractor correspond to the first layers of a CNN, well-trained over ImageNet. Features are fed into few extra convolutional layers, which forms our “segmentation network”.

Training is achieved by maximizing the classification likelihood over the classification training set (subset of Imagenet), by adding an extra layer to our network, which constrains the model to put more weight on pixels which are important for the classification decision. At test time, the constraining layer is removed, and the label of each image pixel is efficiently inferred. Figure 1 shows a general illustration of our approach.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents related work. Section 3 describes our architecture choices. Section 4 compares our model with both weakly and fully supervised state-of-the-art approaches. We conclude in Section 5.

## 2. Related Work

Labeling data for segmentation task is difficult if compared to labeling data for classification. For this reason, several weakly supervised object segmentation systems have been proposed in the past few years. For instance, Vezhnevets and Buhmann [25] proposed an approach based on Semantic Texton Forest, derived in the context of MIL. However, the model fails to model relationship between superpixels. To model these relationships, [26] introduced a graphical model – named Multi-Image Model (MIM) – to connect superpixels from all training images, based on their appearance similarity. The unary potentials of the MIM are initialized with the output of [25].

In [27], the authors define a parametric family of struc-

tured models, where each model carries visual cues in a different way. A maximum expected agreement model selection principle evaluates the quality of a model from a family. An algorithm based on Gaussian processes is proposed to efficiently search the best model for different visual cues.

More recently, [30] proposed an algorithm that learns the distribution of spatially structural superpixel sets from image-level labels. This is achieved by first extracting graphlets (small graphs consisting of superpixels and encapsulating their spatial structure) from a given image. Labels from the training images are transferred into graphlets throughout a proposed manifold embedding algorithm. A Gaussian mixture model is then used to learn the distribution of the post-embedding graphlets, *i.e.* vectors output from the graphlet embedding. The inference is done by leveraging the learned GMM prior to measure the structure homogeneity of a test image.

In contrast with previous approaches for weakly supervised segmentation, we avoid designing task-specific features for segmentation. Instead, a CNN learns the features: the model is trained through a cost function which casts the problem of segmentation into the problem of finding pixel-level labels from image-level labels. As we will see in Section 4, learning the right features for segmentation leads to better performance compared to existing weakly supervised segmentation system. Another difference from our approach is that we train our model in a different dataset (Imagenet) from the one we validate the results (Pascal VOC).

**Transfer Learning and CNNs** In the last few years, convolutional networks have been widely used in the context of object recognition. A notable system is the one from Krizhevsky *et al.* [12], which performs very well on Imagenet. In [17] the authors built upon Krizhevsky’s approach and showed that a model trained for classification on Imagenet dataset can be used for classification in a different dataset (namely Pascal VOC) by taking into account the bounding box information. In a recent yet unpublished work [18], the authors adapt an Imagenet-trained CNN to the Pascal VOC classification task. The network is fine-tuned on Pascal VOC, by modifying the cost function to include a final max-pooling layer. Similar to our aggregation layer, the max-pooling outputs a single image-level score for each of the classes. In contrast, (1) we not limit ourselves to the Pascal VOC classification problem, but tackle the more challenging problem of segmentation and (2) our model is not fine-tuned on Pascal VOC.

In the same spirit, Girshick *et al.* [10] showed that a model trained for classification on Imagenet can be adapted for object detection on Pascal VOC. The authors proposed to combine bottom-up techniques for generating detection region candidates with CNNs. The authors achieved state-

of-the-art performance in object detection. Based upon this work, [11] derived a model that detects all instances of a category in an image and, for each instance, marks the pixels that belong to it. Their model, entitled SDS (Simultaneous Detection and Segmentation), uses category-specific, top-down figure-ground predictions to refine bottom-up detection candidates.

As for these existing state-of-the-art approaches, our system leverages features learned over the Imagenet classification dataset. However, our approach differs from theirs in some important aspects. Compared to [10, 17], we consider the more challenging problem of object segmentation and do not use any information other than the image-level annotation. [18] consider a weakly supervised scenario, but only deals with the classification problem. Compared to [11], we consider only the the image-level annotation to infer the pixel-level one. In that respect, we do not use any segmentation information (our model is not refined over the segmentation data either), nor bounding box annotation during the training period. One could argue that a classification dataset like Imagenet has somewhat already cropped properly objects. While this might true for certain objects, it is not the case for many images, and in any case the “bounding box” remains quite loose.

### 3. Architecture

As we pointed out in Section 1, CNNs are a very flexible model which can be applied on various image processing tasks, as they alleviate the need of task-specific features. CNNs learn a hierarchy of filters, which extract higher level of representations as one goes “deeper” in the hierarchy [29]. The type of features they learn is also sufficiently general that CNNs make transfer learning (to another task) quite easy. The main drawback of these models, however, is that a large amount of data is necessary during training.

Since the number of image-level object labels is much bigger than pixel-level segmentation labels, it is thus natural to leverage image classification datasets for performing segmentation. In the following, we consider a problem of segmentation with a set of classes  $\mathcal{C}$ . We assume the classification dataset contains *at least* the same classes. Extra classes available at classification time, but which are not in the segmentation dataset are mapped to a “background” class. This background class is essential to limit the number of false positive during segmentation.

Our architecture is a CNN, which is trained over a subset of Imagenet, to produce pixel-level labels from image-level labels. As shown in Figure 2, our CNN is quite standard, with 10 levels of convolutions and (optional) pooling. It takes as input a  $400 \times 400$  RGB patch  $I$ , and outputs  $|\mathcal{C}| + 1$  planes (one per class, plus the background class) corresponding to the score of the 12-times downsampled

image pixels labels. During training, an extra layer, described in Section 3.1, aggregates pixel-level labels into an image-level label. For computational power reasons, we “froze” the first layers of our CNN, to the ones of some already well-trained (over Imagenet classification data) CNN model.

We pick Overfeat [21], trained to perform object classification on the ILSVRC13 challenge. The Overfeat model generates feature maps of dimensions  $1024 \times h^i \times w^i$ , where  $h^i$  and  $w^i$  are functions of the size of the RGB input image, the convolution kernel sizes, convolution strides and max-pooling sizes. Keeping only the first 6 convolution layers and 2 pooling layers of Overfeat, our RGB  $400 \times 400$  image patch  $I$  is transformed into a  $1024 \times 29 \times 29$  feature representation.

We add four extra convolutional layers (we denote  $\mathbf{H}^6$  for feature planes coming out from OverFeat). Each of them (but the last one  $\mathbf{Y}$ ) is followed by a pointwise rectification non-linearity (ReLU) [16]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{H}^p &= \max(0, \mathbf{W}^p \mathbf{H}^{p-1} + \mathbf{b}^p), \quad p \in \{7, 8, 9\}, \\ \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{W}^{10} \mathbf{H}^9 + \mathbf{b}^{10}.\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Parameters of the  $p^{th}$  layer are denoted with  $(\mathbf{W}^p, \mathbf{b}^p)$ . On this step, we do not use any max-pooling. A dropout regularization strategy [23] is applied on all layers. The network outputs  $|\mathcal{C}| + 1$  feature planes of dimensions  $h^o \times w^o$ , one for each class considered on training, plus background.

#### 3.1. Multiple Instance Learning

The network produces one score  $s_{i,j}^k = Y_{i,j}^k$  for each pixel location  $(i, j)$  from the subsampled image  $I$ , and for each class  $k \in \mathcal{C}$ . Given that at training time we have only access to image classification labels, we need a way to aggregate these pixel-level scores into a single image-level classification score  $s^k = \text{agg}reg_{i,j}(s_{i,j}^k)$ , that will then be maximized for the right class label  $k^*$ . Assuming an aggregation procedure  $\text{agg}reg()$  is chosen, we interpret image-level class scores as class conditional probabilities by applying a softmax [3]:

$$p(k|I, \theta) = \frac{e^{s^k}}{\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} e^{s^c}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta = \{\mathbf{W}^p, \mathbf{b}^p \forall p\}$  represents all the trainable parameters of our architecture. We then maximize the log-likelihood (with respect to  $\theta$ ), over all the training dataset pairs  $(I, k^*)$ :

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{(k^*, I)} \left[ s^{k^*} - \log \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} e^{s^c} \right]. \quad (3)$$

Training is achieved with stochastic gradient, backpropagating through the softmax, the aggregation procedure, and up the to first non-frozen layers of our network.




Figure 2: **Outline of our architecture.** The full RGB image is forwarded through the network (composed of Overfeat and four extra convolutional features), generating output planes of dimension  $(|C| + 1) \times h^o \times w^o$ . These output planes can be seen as pixel-level labels of a sub-sampled version of the input image. The output then passes through the *Log-Sum-Exp* layer to aggregate pixel-level labels into image-level ones. The error is backpropagated through layers C10-C7.

**Aggregation** The aggregation should drive the network towards correct pixel-level assignments, such that it could perform decently on segmentation tasks. An obvious aggregation would be to take the sum over all pixel positions:

$$s^k = \sum_{i,j} s_{i,j}^k \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (4)$$

This would however assigns the same weight on all pixels of the image during the training procedure, even to the ones which do not belong to the class label assigned to the image. Note that this aggregation method is equivalent as applying a traditional fully-connected classification CNN with a mini-batch. Indeed, each value in the  $h^o \times w^o$  output plane corresponds to the output of the CNN fed with a sub-patch centered around the correspond pixel in the input plane. At the other end, one could apply a max pooling aggregation:

$$s^k = \max_{i,j} s_{i,j}^k \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (5)$$

This would encourage the model to increase the score of the pixel which is considered as the most important for image-level classification. In our experience, this type of approach does not train very well. Note that at the beginning of the training all pixels might have the same (wrong) score, but only one (selected by the max) will have its score increased at each step of the training procedure. It is thus not surprising it takes an enormous amount of time to the model to converge.

We chose instead a smooth version and convex approximation of the *max* function, called *Log-Sum-Exp* (LSE) [2]:

$$s^k = \frac{1}{r} \log \left[ \frac{1}{h^o w^o} \sum_{i,j} \exp(r s_{i,j}^k) \right]. \quad (6)$$

The hyper-parameter  $r$  controls how smooth one wants the approximation to be: high  $r$  values implies having an effect similar to the max, very low values will have an effect

similar to the score averaging. The advantage of this aggregation is that pixels having similar scores will have a similar weight in the training procedure,  $r$  controlling this notion of “similarity”.

### 3.2. Inference

At test time, we feed the padded and normalized RGB test image  $I$  (of dimension  $3 \times h \times w$ ) to our network, where the aggregation layer has been removed. We thus obtain  $|C| + 1$  planes of pixel-level scores  $s_{i,j}^k$  ( $1 \leq i \leq h^o$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq w^o$ ). For convenience (see Section 3.2.1), we transform these scores into conditional probabilities  $p_{i,j}(k|I)$  using a softmax over each location  $(i, j)$ .

Due to the pooling layers in the CNN, the output planes labels correspond to a sub-sampled version of the input test image. As shown in [15, 19], one can efficiently retrieve the label of all pixels of the image using a CNN model, by simply shifting the input image in both spatial directions, and forwarding it again through the network.

#### 3.2.1 Adding Segmentation Priors

Given we do not fine-tune our model on segmentation data, we observed our approach is subject to false positive. To circumvent this issue, we consider simple post-processing techniques, namely image-level prior (ILP) and three different smoothing priors (SP), with increasing amount of information. Figure 3 summarizes the pipeline of our approach during inference time.

**Image-Level Prior** The model makes inference using local context based on the patch surrounding a pixel. In order to improve the overall per-pixel accuracy, we add the global context information of the scene into play. We propose the use of an image-level prior (ILP) [22, 25] based on the output feature planes. This prior, which is extracted from the trained network, is important to reduce the number of false






Figure 3: **Inference Pipeline.** The test image is forwarded through the segmentation network to generate a  $(|\mathcal{C}| + 1) \times h \times w$  output, one plane for each class. The image-level prior is extracted from these planes and the class of each pixel is selected by taking the maximum probability for each pixel. A smoothing prior is also considered to generate a smoother segmentation output.

positives generated by the model. As at training time, the probability  $p(k|I)$  of each class  $k \in \mathcal{C}$  to be present in the scene can be computed by applying the softmax in the LSE score of each label plane. This probability is used as the image-level prior to encourage the likely categories and discourage the unlikely ones.

The ILP is integrated into the system by multiplying each conditional probability  $p_{i,j}(k|I)$  by its class ILP, that is:

$$\hat{y}'_{i,j}(k) = p_{i,j}(k|I) \times p(k|I), \quad (7)$$

for each location  $(i, j)$  and class  $k \in \mathcal{C}$ .

**Smoothing Prior** Predicting the class of each pixel independently from its neighbors yields noisy predictions. In general, objects have smooth boundaries and well defined shapes, different from the background which tends to be amorphous regions. At test time we considered three different approaches (of increasing prior knowledge) to impose local regions with strong boundaries to be assigned to the same label:

- (i) *SP-sppxl* smooths the output using standard superpixels. We followed the method proposed by [9], which largely over-segments a given image into a set of disjoint components. Prediction smoothing is achieved by simply picking the label that appears the most in each superpixel.
- (ii) *SP-bb* leverages *bounding box candidates* to improve the smoothing. We picked the BING algorithm [5] to generate a set of  $10^4$  (possibly overlapping) bounding box proposals given an image, each bounding box having a score. These scores are normalized to fit the  $[0, 1]$  interval. Each pixel  $(i, j)$  in the image is assigned a score (of belonging to an object) by summing the score of all bounding box proposals that contains the pixel. The score at each pixel is then converted into a probability  $p((i, j) \in \text{Obj})$  by normalizing the sum by the

number of boxes containing the pixel. Label smoothing for each pixel  $(i, j)$  is then achieved with:

$$\hat{y}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } \max_{k \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{y}'_{i,j}(k) \times p((i, j) \in \text{Obj}) > \delta_k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where  $\delta_k$  ( $0 \leq \delta_k < 1$ ) is a per-class confidence threshold and  $\hat{y}_{i,j} = 0$  means that background class is assigned to the pixel.

- (iii) *SP-seg* is a smoothing prior which has been trained with *class-independent* segmentation labels. We consider the Multiscale Combinatorial Grouping (MCG) algorithm [1], which generates a series of overlapping object candidates with a corresponding score. Pixel label smoothing is then achieved in the same way as in *SP-bb*.

The smoothing prior improves our algorithm in two ways: (i) it forces pixels with low probability of being part of an object to be labeled as background and (ii) it guarantees local label consistency. While the former reduces the number of false positives, the latter increases the number of true positives. We will see in Section 4 that (as it can be expected) more complex smoothing priors improves performance accuracy.

## 4. Experiments

Given that our model uses only weak supervision labels (class labels), and is never trained with segmentation data, we compare our approach with current state-of-the-art *weakly supervised* segmentation systems. We also compare it against state-of-the-art *fully supervised* segmentation systems, to demonstrate that weakly supervised segmentation is a promising and viable solution.

### 4.1. Datasets

We considered the Pascal VOC dataset as a benchmark for segmentation. This dataset includes 20 different classes,

| Conv. Layer | 1              | 2              | 3              | 4              |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| # channels  | 1024           | 768            | 512            | 21             |
| Filter Size | $3 \times 3$   | $3 \times 3$   | $3 \times 3$   | $3 \times 3$   |
| Input Size  | $29 \times 29$ | $27 \times 27$ | $25 \times 25$ | $23 \times 23$ |

Table 1: **Architecture Design.** Architecture of the segmenter network used in our experiments.

and represents a particular challenge as an object segmentation task. The objects from these classes can appear in many different poses, possibly highly occluded, and also possess a very large intra-class variation. The dataset was only used for testing purposes, not for training.

We created a large classification training set from the Imagenet dataset containing images of each of the twenty classes and also an extra class labeled as `background` – set of images in which none of the classes appear. We consider all the sub-classes located below each of the twenty classes in the full Imagenet tree, for a total of around 700,000 samples. For the background, we chose a subset of Imagenet consisting of a total of around 60,000 images not containing any of the twenty classes<sup>1</sup>. To increase the size of the training set, jitter (horizontal flip, rotation, scaling, brightness and contrast modification) was randomly added to each occurrence of an image during the training procedure. Each image was then normalized for each RGB channel. No other preprocessing was done during training.

## 4.2. Experimental Setup

Each training sample consists of a central patch of size  $400 \times 400$  randomly extracted from a deformed image in the training set. If the image dimensions are smaller than  $400 \times 400$ , it is rescaled such that its smaller dimension is of size 400.

The first layers of our network are extracted (and “frozen”) from the public available `Overfeat`<sup>2</sup> model. In all our experiments, we use the *slow* Overfeat model, as described in [21]. With the  $400 \times 400$  RGB input image, the `Overfeat` feature extractor outputs 1024 feature maps of dimension  $29 \times 29$ . As detailed in Section 3, these feature maps are then fed into 4 additional convolutional layers followed by ReLU non-linearity. A dropout procedure with a rate of 0.5 is applied on each layer. The whole network has a total of around 20 million parameters. Table 1 details the architecture used in our experiments.

<sup>1</sup>60K background images might look surprisingly not large, but we found not easy to pick images where none of the 20 Pascal VOC classes were not present.

<sup>2</sup><http://cilvr.nyu.edu/doku.php?id=software:overfeat:start>

| Model             | VOC2008       | VOC2009       | VOC2010       |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>MIM</b>        | 8.11%         | 38.27%        | 28.43%        |
| <b>GMIM</b>       | 9.24%         | 39.16%        | 29.71%        |
| <b>PGC</b>        | 30.12%        | 43.37%        | 32.14%        |
| <b>aggreg-max</b> | 44.31%        | 45.46%        | 45.88%        |
| <b>aggreg-sum</b> | 47.54%        | 50.01%        | 50.11%        |
| <b>aggreg-LSE</b> | <b>56.25%</b> | <b>57.01%</b> | <b>56.12%</b> |

Table 2: **Comparison with weakly supervised.** Averaged per-class accuracy of weakly supervised models and ours for different Pascal VOC datasets. We consider three different aggregation layers.

The final convolution layer outputs a 21 feature maps of dimension  $21 \times 21$ . These feature maps are passed through the aggregation layer (in the case of LSE, we consider  $r = 5$ ), which outputs 21 scores, one for each class. These scores are then transformed into posterior probabilities through a *softmax* layer.

Design architecture and hyper-parameters were chosen considering the validation data of the Pascal VOC 2012 segmentation dataset. We considered a learning rate  $\lambda = 0.001$  which decreases by a factor of 0.8 for every 5 million examples seen by the model. We trained our model using stochastic gradient descent with a batch size of 16 examples, momentum 0.9 and weight decay of 0.00005.

The optimal class confidence thresholds  $\delta_k$  for smoothing priors (see Section 3.2.1) were chosen through a grid search. The AP changes in function of the confidence threshold for each class. The different values for the threshold is due to the variability of each class in the training data and how their statistics approach the Pascal VOC images statistics.

Our network takes about a week to train on a Nvidia GeForce Titan GPU with 6GB of memory. All the experiments were conducted using Torch7<sup>3</sup>.

## 4.3. Experimental Results

**Compared to weakly supervised models** We compare the proposed algorithm with three state-of-the-art approaches in weakly supervised segmentation scenario: (i) Multi-Image Model (MIM) [26], (ii) a variant, Generalized Multi-Image Model (GMIM) [27] and (iii) the most recent Probabilistic Graphlet Cut (PGC) [30, 31]. Note that there are variations in the experimental setup on the experiments. The compared models use Pascal VOC for weak supervision while we use Imagenet. Also, (iii) considers

<sup>3</sup><http://torch.ch>

|                       | bend | aero | bike | bird | boat | bottle | bus  | car  | cat  | chair | cow  | table | dog  | horse | mbike | person | plant | sheep | sofa | train | tv   | mAP  |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|------|
| Fully Sup.            |      |      |      |      |      |        |      |      |      |       |      |       |      |       |       |        |       |       |      |       |      |      |
| <b>O<sub>2</sub>P</b> | 86.1 | 64.0 | 27.3 | 54.1 | 39.2 | 48.7   | 56.6 | 57.7 | 52.5 | 14.2  | 54.8 | 29.6  | 42.2 | 58.0  | 54.8  | 50.2   | 36.6  | 58.6  | 31.6 | 48.4  | 38.6 | 47.8 |
| <b>DivMBest</b>       | 85.7 | 62.7 | 25.6 | 46.9 | 43.0 | 54.8   | 58.4 | 58.6 | 55.6 | 14.6  | 47.5 | 31.2  | 44.7 | 51.0  | 60.9  | 53.5   | 36.6  | 50.9  | 30.1 | 50.2  | 46.8 | 48.1 |
| <b>SDS</b>            | 86.3 | 63.3 | 25.7 | 63.0 | 39.8 | 59.2   | 70.9 | 61.4 | 54.9 | 16.8  | 45.0 | 48.2  | 50.5 | 51.0  | 57.7  | 63.3   | 31.8  | 58.7  | 31.2 | 55.7  | 48.5 | 51.6 |
| Weak. Sup.            |      |      |      |      |      |        |      |      |      |       |      |       |      |       |       |        |       |       |      |       |      |      |
| <b>Ours-sppxl</b>     | 74.7 | 38.8 | 19.8 | 27.5 | 21.7 | 32.8   | 40.0 | 50.1 | 47.1 | 7.2   | 44.8 | 15.8  | 49.4 | 47.3  | 36.6  | 36.4   | 24.3  | 44.5  | 21.0 | 31.5  | 41.3 | 35.8 |
| <b>Ours-bb</b>        | 76.2 | 42.8 | 20.9 | 29.6 | 25.9 | 38.5   | 40.6 | 51.7 | 49.0 | 9.1   | 43.5 | 16.2  | 50.1 | 46.0  | 35.8  | 38.0   | 22.1  | 44.5  | 22.4 | 30.8  | 43.0 | 37.0 |
| <b>Ours-seg</b>       | 78.7 | 48.0 | 21.2 | 31.1 | 28.4 | 35.1   | 51.4 | 55.5 | 52.8 | 7.8   | 56.2 | 19.9  | 53.8 | 50.3  | 40.0  | 38.6   | 27.8  | 51.8  | 24.7 | 33.3  | 46.3 | 40.6 |

Table 3: **Comparison with fully supervised.** Per class average precision and mean average precision (mAP) on Pascal VOC 2012 segmentation challenge *test set*. We consider different smoothing priors in our model.

additional labels on the data. In our training framework, the Pascal VOC dataset was used only for selecting the thresholds on the class priors. Our system learns features that are independent of the Pascal VOC data distribution and would a priori yields similar results in other datasets.

Table 2 reports the results of the three compared models and our approach. In our experiments, we consider the *SP-sppxl* smoothing prior, which does not take into account any segmentation or bounding box information. We consider the three aggregation layers described in Section 3.1. This result empirically demonstrates our choice of the *Log-Sum-Exp* layer.

The results for the compared models reported on this table are from Zhang *et al.* [30]. We use the same metric and evaluate on the same datasets (Pascal VOC 2008, 2009 and 2010) as the authors. The metric used, average per-class accuracy, is defined by the ratio of correct classified pixels of each class. We show that our model achieves significantly better results than the previous state-of-the-art weakly supervised algorithms, with an increase from 30% to 90% in average per-class accuracy.

**Compared to fully supervised models** In table 3, we compare the performance of our model against the best performers in Pascal VOC 2012 segmentation competition: Second Order Pooling (O<sub>2</sub>P) [4], DivMBest [28] and Simultaneous Detection and Segmentation (SDS) [11]. Average precision metric<sup>4</sup>, as defined by the Pascal VOC competition, is reported. We show results using all three smoothing priors (as described in 3.2.1). The performance of our model increases as we consider more complex priors.

We reach near state-of-the-art performance for several classes (even with the simplest smoothing prior *SP-sppxl*, which is object and segmentation agnostic) while some other classes perform worse. This is not really surprising, given that the statistics of the images for some classes (*e.g.*

*dog, cat, cow*) are closer in the two different datasets than for some other classes (*e.g. bird, person*). The results on the specific Pascal VOC challenge could be improved by “cheating” and considering training images that are more similar to those represented on the test data (*e.g.* instead of choosing all *bird* images from Imagenet, we could have chosen the *bird* breeds that are similar to the ones presented on Pascal VOC).

**Effect of Priors** Table 4 shows the average precision of each class on the Pascal VOC 2012 validation set considering the inference assuming no prior was used (base), only the image-level prior (base+ILP) and the image-level together with different smoothing priors (base+ILP+SP-sppxl, base+ILP+SP-bb, base+ILP+SP-seg). Figure 4 illustrates inference in Pascal VOC images assuming different steps of inference. Priors have a huge importance to reduce false positives, and smooth predictions.

## 5. Conclusion

We proposed an innovative framework to segment objects with weakly supervision only. Our algorithm is able to distinguish, at a pixel level, the differences between different classes, assuming only few simple prior knowledge about segmentation. This is an interesting result as one might circumvent the necessity of using the very costly segmentation datasets and use only image-level annotations. Our approach surpasses by a large margin previous state-of-the-art models for weakly supervised segmentation. We also achieve competitive performance (at least for several classes) compared to state-of-the-art fully supervised segmentation systems.

<sup>4</sup>AP =  $\frac{TruePositive}{TruePositive+FalsePositive+FalseNegative}$



Figure 4: **Inference results.** For each test image (left), we show the output assuming the image-level prior (center) and image-level and *SP-seg* smoothing prior (right).

|                   | bgnd | aero | bike | bird | boat | bottle | bus  | car  | cat   | chair | cow  | table | dog  | horse | mbike | person | plant | sheep | sofa | train | tv   | mAP  |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|------|
| base              | 37.0 | 10.4 | 12.4 | 10.8 | 5.3  | 5.7    | 25.2 | 21.1 | 25.15 | 4.8   | 21.5 | 8.6   | 29.1 | 25.1  | 23.6  | 25.5   | 12.0  | 28.4  | 8.9  | 22.0  | 11.6 | 17.8 |
| base+ILP          | 73.2 | 25.4 | 18.2 | 22.7 | 21.5 | 28.6   | 39.5 | 44.7 | 46.6  | 11.9  | 40.4 | 11.8  | 45.6 | 40.1  | 35.5  | 35.2   | 20.8  | 41.7  | 17.0 | 34.7  | 30.4 | 32.6 |
| base+ILP+SP-sppxl | 77.2 | 37.3 | 18.4 | 25.4 | 28.2 | 31.9   | 41.6 | 48.1 | 50.7  | 12.7  | 45.7 | 14.6  | 50.9 | 44.1  | 39.2  | 37.9   | 28.3  | 44.0  | 19.6 | 37.6  | 35.0 | 36.6 |
| base+ILP+SP-bb    | 78.6 | 46.9 | 18.6 | 27.9 | 30.7 | 38.4   | 44.0 | 49.6 | 49.8  | 11.6  | 44.7 | 14.6  | 50.4 | 44.7  | 40.8  | 38.5   | 26.0  | 45.0  | 20.5 | 36.9  | 34.8 | 37.8 |
| base+ILP+SP-seg   | 79.6 | 50.2 | 21.6 | 40.6 | 34.9 | 40.5   | 45.9 | 51.5 | 60.6  | 12.6  | 51.2 | 11.6  | 56.8 | 52.9  | 44.8  | 42.7   | 31.2  | 55.4  | 21.5 | 38.8  | 36.9 | 42.0 |

Table 4: **Effect of priors on segmentation.** Per class average precision on Pascal VOC 2012 *validation set*. We consider the inference with no priors (base), with image-level prior (base+ILP) and different smoothing priors (base+ILP+SP-sppxl, base+ILP+SP-bb, base+ILP+SP-seg).

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank the reviewers for their useful feedback and comments. This work was supported by Idiap Research Institute.

## References

- [1] P. Arbeláez, J. Pont-Tuset, J. Barron, F. Marques, and J. Malik. Multiscale combinatorial grouping. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 5
- [2] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004. 4
- [3] J. S. Bridle. Probabilistic interpretation of feedforward classification network outputs, with relationships to statistical pattern recognition. *Neurocomputing: Algorithms, Architectures and Applications*, 1990. 3
- [4] J. Carreira, R. Caseiro, J. Batista, and C. Sminchisescu. Semantic segmentation with second-order pooling. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2012. 7
- [5] M. Cheng, Z. Zhang, W. Lin, and P. H. S. Torr. BING: Binarized normed gradients for objectness estimation at 300fps. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 5
- [6] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2009. 2
- [7] M. Everingham, L. V. Gool, C. K. I. Williams, J. Winn, and A. Zisserman. The pascal visual object classes (VOC) challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2010. 1
- [8] C. Farabet, C. Couprie, L. Najman, and Y. LeCun. Learning hierarchical features for scene labeling. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 2013. 1



- [9] P. F. Felzenszwalb and D. P. Huttenlocher. Efficient graph-based image segmentation. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, 2004. 5
- [10] R. Girshick, J. Donahue, T. Darrell, and J. Malik. Rich feature hierarchies for accurate object detection and semantic segmentation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 2, 3
- [11] B. Hariharan, P. Arbeláez, R. Girshick, and J. Malik. Simultaneous detection and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2014. 2, 3, 7
- [12] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*. 2012. 1, 2
- [13] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 1998. 1
- [14] O. Maron and T. Lozano-Pérez. A framework for multiple instance learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 1998. 2
- [15] J. Masci, A. Giusti, D. C. Ciresan, G. Fricout, and J. Schmidhuber. A fast learning algorithm for image segmentation with max-pooling convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP13)*, 2013. 4
- [16] V. Nair and G. E. Hinton. Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2010. 3
- [17] M. Oquab, L. Bottou, I. Laptev, and J. Sivic. Learning and transferring mid-level image representations using convolutional neural networks. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014. 2, 3
- [18] M. Oquab, L. Bottou, I. Laptev, and J. Sivic. Weakly supervised object recognition with convolutional neural networks. Technical report, INRIA, 2014. 2, 3
- [19] P. H. O. Pinheiro and R. Collobert. Recurrent convolutional neural networks for scene labeling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2014. 4
- [20] A. S. Razavian, H. Azizpour, J. Sullivan, and S. Carlsson. CNN features off-the-shelf: an astounding baseline for recognition. *CoRR*, 2014. 2
- [21] P. Sermanet, D. Eigen, X. Zhang, M. Mathieu, R. Fergus, and Y. LeCun. OverFeat: Integrated Recognition, Localization and Detection using Convolutional Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014. 2, 3, 6
- [22] J. Shotton, M. Johnson, and R. Cipolla. Semantic textron forests for image categorization and segmentation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2008. 4
- [23] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2014. 3
- [24] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich. Going Deeper with Convolutions. 2014. 1
- [25] A. Vezhnevets and J. M. Buhmann. Towards weakly supervised semantic segmentation by means of multiple instance and multitask learning. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2010. 2, 4
- [26] A. Vezhnevets, V. Ferrari, , and J. Buhmann. Weakly supervised semantic segmentation with a multi-image model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2011. 2, 6
- [27] A. Vezhnevets, V. Ferrari, and J. M. Buhmann. Weakly supervised structured output learning for semantic segmentation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2012. 2, 6
- [28] P. Yadollahpour, D. Batra, and G. Shakhnarovich. Discriminative re-ranking of diverse segmentations. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2013. 7
- [29] M. Zeiler and R. Fergus. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2014. 3
- [30] L. Zhang, Y. Gao, Y. Xia, K. Lu, J. Shen, and R. Ji. Representative discovery of structure cues for weakly-supervised image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2014. 2, 6, 7
- [31] L. Zhang, M. Song, Z. Liu, X. Liu, J. Bu, and C. Chen. Probabilistic graphlet cut: Exploiting spatial structure cue for weakly supervised image segmentation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2013. 6