
DD2424 Group 118:

The mechanisms, powers and limitations of some Data Augmentation techniques

Anton Stråhle

Jan Alexandersson

Fredrika Lundahl

Abstract

300 words maximum, currently 100 words

To obtain good results in deep learning the quality and quantity of the data is crucial. A smart and cheap way of increasing and improving the available data is data augmentation. In this project we have tried different augmentation techniques such as mix up, Fourier transforms, colour magnification and ordinary rotations and translations on top of a two different decently performing CNNs and tried to see during which circumstances the augmentations have effect, and how big that effect is. The data set used consist of about 25 000 coloured images of 190 bird species, mostly from the United States. Our results show. . . .

1 Introduction

0.5-0.75 pages

Describe the problem you are working on and why it is important. Then also briefly describe what you did and give an overview of your results.

One of the major drawbacks of supervised learning is the need of immense amounts labeled data, producing such in the quantity needed for optimal results can be both costly and extremely time demanding, if even possible at all, which may be the case with medical data where only a limited number of known and active cases may exist. KÅLLA

Data augmentation provides a partly solution to this issue when it comes to image classification and after being briefly introduced to some data augmentation techniques during the lectures we wanted to explore this topic further and investigate how simple changes may give great payoff. We are also very interested in interpretability and have used this project to in an experimental way find the how, when and whys.

Our main focus is to try out mixup and Fourier transformation in practice, but we have also chosen to apply some more standard augmentations such as rotations and translations to have something to compare with, as well as color magnification which we thought might do well since that might be the most distinguishing attribute for many birds.

To clarify, our project does not aim to obtain the highest possible testing accuracy but rather aim to show the impact of data augmentation on the accuracy.

For our experiments we set up two CNNs on top of which we conducted our experiments ***kortfattad text om nätverken***

To create different settings we divided the original data into different subsets with different sizes and characteristics, some random and some more targeted such as black and white birds, some with very little training images per species and some with more.

overview of results

2 Related Work

0.5-0.75 pages

3 Data

0.5-0.75 pages

In this project we have worked with a dataset consisting of images of different species of birds, [Bird Species Dataset](#). Each image has the format $224 \times 224 \times 3$ and the images are cropped such that the bird covers at least 50% of the pixels. There are a total of 190 species. The training data consist of 25812 images, but the data is not balanced, however each species has a least 100 training images. Both the validation set and the test set consist of 5 images of each species. It should also be said that the around 80% of the images are of male birds and 20% of female birds which, by the nature of birds, may look entirely different, which has sometimes caused some trouble when the data set has been used.

We will not always work with the full dataset but instead use the following subsets:

- Randomized selection of birds
- Black and White birds
- Bright colored birds
- Dull colored birds

and small-, medium- and large sized subsets of all of them. ***specificera antalet i small, medium, large *** The sizes decide the number of training images per species, the number of species we have in a subset is XXX.

4 Methods

1.5-2.5 pages *Discuss your approach for solving the problems that you set up in the introduction. Why is your approach the right thing to do? Did you consider alternative approaches? You should demonstrate that you have applied ideas and skills built up during the course to tackle your problem of choice. It may be helpful to include figures, diagrams, or tables to describe your method or compare it with other methods.*

4.1 Mixup

The concept of Mixup was introduced by [Zhang et al\(2018\)](#) and is really fascinating because of its creativeness and ability to improve performance while being very simple.

Mixup is a data augmentation technique which creates virtual training example by combining two images by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{x} &= \lambda x_i + (1 - \lambda)x_j, & \text{where } x_i, x_j \text{ are input vectors} \\ \tilde{y} &= \lambda y_i + (1 - \lambda)y_j, & \text{where } y_i, y_j \text{ are one-hot encoded labels}\end{aligned}$$

where (x_i, y_i) and (x_j, y_j) are two randomly drawn examples from the training data, and λ is a probability, that is $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Some examples where mixup was performed is shown in Figure 1. Usually, λ is randomly drawn from a $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$ distribution, for each pair of images which are to be combined. This distribution seems like a reasonable choice since it has the right support and the Beta-distribution is the most natural distribution to consider when working with probabilities. The $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$ -distribution is also symmetric around 0.5, which may be a desirable property, however this should not matter since we combine our randomly drawn examples with weights λ and $1 - \lambda$ and it would not matter if, for example $\lambda = 0.2$ or $\lambda = 0.8$ since it would yield the same two weights, but in different order, but since our examples are randomly drawn the order of the weight should not have an impact.

When reading about mixup, the use of the Beta-distribution is usually taken for granted, however, there are many other distributions which could be considered since the only requirement is that the distribution satisfy $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We will therefore not only consider the Beta-distribution.

WRITE ABOUT OTHER DISTRIBUTION(S) (logit-normal)

We will also consider only performing mixup on the input vectors of the training images but letting \tilde{y} keep the label of the example with the highest weight. That is,

$$\tilde{y} = I_{\{\lambda \leq 0.5\}} y_i + (1 - I_{\{\lambda \leq 0.5\}}) y_j,$$



Figure 1: Three examples of mixup performed on images of different bird species.

4.2 Fourier Transformation

The 2D Fourier transform is used for instance in image compression and gave us the idea of the possibility using it in deep learning and image classification. The 2D fast Fourier transform takes our image, with size $[224 \times 224 \times 3]$, as input and returns a complex matrix of the same size. From this output we can now get the amplitudes by taking the absolute value of each element in the matrix and the phase angles by computing $\arctan(y, x)$, where x is the real part and y is the complex part. An interesting property is that the phase angles are more important than the amplitudes and contain more information necessary to recreate the image again. As an example, in Figure 2 the Fourier transform was applied to two images which yielded amplitudes and phase angles respectively. The images were then recreated using the amplitudes from the first image and the phase angles from the second image and vice versa.




Figure 2: Example of recreation of images using amplitudes and phase angles of the Fourier transformation. Bottom left image uses the amplitudes from the first image and the phase angles from the second image and bottom right image uses the phase angles from the first image and the amplitudes from the second image

Using this as the inspiration we wanted to see if it is true that the phase angles contain more essential information about the image by image classification on the amplitudes and phase angles respectively to see if our hypothesis of higher accuracy on the phase angles is satisfied or not.

Initially we had no expectations that using the Fourier transform as augmentation would yield an increase in the classification accuracy compared to using the raw data, however we thought it would be an interesting experiment. In Figure 3 we can see an example of the Fourier transformation on one of the images in our dataset.




Figure 3: Left: Original image. Middle: Phase angles. Right: Amplitudes.

5 Experiments

1.5-2.5 pages

Discuss the experiments that you performed to demonstrate that your approach solves the problem. The exact experiments will vary depending on the project, but you might compare with previously published methods, perform an ablation study to determine the impact of various components of your system, experiment with different hyperparameters or architectural choices, use visualization techniques to gain insight into how your model works, discuss common failure modes of your model, etc. You should include graphs, tables, or other figures to illustrate your experimental results.

5.1 Underlying CNN

In order to examine the effects of our data augmentation methods we wanted to observe them for a variety of networks with different baseline performances. We used both transfer as well as deep learning in order to examine the data augmentation techniques. Below are the networks we examined and roughly their baseline, i.e. without any augmentation, accuracy on the birds dataset after some training.

- (i) Basic CNN (65%)
- (ii) MobileNet trained on Imagenet (75%)
- (iii) ResNet50 trained on Imagenet (95%)

5.2 Augmentations

Attempted experiments:

Fourier (angles) does not seem to work with MobileNet at all when training for 10 epochs. In this case we do not use the base weights but instead use the base architecture of MobileNet and random initialization (note that this is used as the weights available are from imagenet which by no means can be related to our Fourier transformed data). 10 epochs. Why is this, small network? Validation accuracy seems to stagnate close to 0.56%.

Fourier (angles) seem to work a bit better on the Base CNN when training for very few epochs. The validation accuracy seems to stagnate at around 25% which of course is a major decrease compared to the 60% obtained using no augmentation.

6 Conclusions

0.25-0.5 pages

Summarize your key results - what have you learned? Suggest ideas for future extensions or new applications of your ideas.

What we have implemented is *input mixup* where we do all augmentation before training and input the images in the network after performing mixup, however <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1806.05236.pdf> suggest a new algorithm called *manifold mixup* where mixup is performed at an intermediate layer or final layer in the network. In an intermediate layer the feature spaces are more aligned than that of the input and it is suggested that mixup will produce better augmented data if the mixup is performed on this layer. Therefore, this would be a natural possible future extension to this project.

References

Exempel:

[1] Alexander, J.A. & Mozer, M.C. (1995) Template-based algorithms for connectionist rule extraction. In G. Tesauro, D.S. Touretzky and T.K. Leen (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 7*, pp. 609–616. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

7 info (ska ej vara med i rapporten)

-Total 6-8 sidor inkl referenser och appendix