

View Author Feedback

Paper ID

3003

Paper Title

Improving MAE against CCE under Label Noise

AUTHOR FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

1. Please upload a one-page rebuttal PDF following instructions on http://iccv2019.thecvf.com/submission/main_conference/author_guidelines. The rebuttal must maintain anonymity and cannot include external links that reveal the authors or circumvent the length requirement. Optionally, you may also enter a brief confidential comment for the Area Chair below.

We believe too many factual errors influenced our score. We want kind help, thanks.

For R#2:

1. 'We only use resnets.'--In fact, we also used GoogLeNet V2 in Table 3.
2. 'Our work is quite close to Goldberger et al. Training deep neural-networks using a noise adaptation layer.'--In fact, there are vital differences: 1) Goldberger et al explicitly estimates latent true labels while our IMAE reweights examples; 2) Our IMAE reweights samples After Softmax by scaling their gradients.
3. 'My biggest concern is majority voting.'--In fact, it is our natural assumption. Being reasonable and intuitive, the majority voting defines meaningful data patterns to learn.

For R#3:

1. Using one-hot ground-truth vector as objective is a common practice. #3 said it was wrong.
2. We evaluated on label noise and did not exaggerate the efficacy. #3 said we were wrong.
3. #3 asked 'whether a validation set is clean?' By default, a validation/test set must be clean for evaluating a model's performance.

AUTHOR FEEDBACK FILES

IMAE_rebuttals_V07.pdf (107 Kb, 26/06/2019, 18:53:45)