

# Maximizing Conditional Entropy for Batch-Mode Active Learning of Perceptual Metrics

Priyadarshini K<sup>1</sup>, Sidhdhartha Chaudhuri<sup>1,2</sup>, Vivek Borkar<sup>1</sup>, Subhasis Chaudhuri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IIT Bombay, <sup>2</sup> Adobe Research

priyadarshini.k@iitb.ac.in, sidch@cse.iitb.ac.in, borkar@ee.iitb.ac.in, sc@ee.iitb.ac.in

## Abstract

Active metric learning is the problem of incrementally selecting batches of training data (typically, ordered triplets) to annotate, in order to progressively improve a learned model of a metric over some input domain as rapidly as possible. Standard approaches, which independently select each triplet in a batch, are susceptible to highly *correlated* batches with many redundant triplets and hence low overall utility. While there has been recent work on selecting *decorrelated* batches for metric learning (Kumari et al. 2020), these methods rely on ad hoc heuristics to estimate the correlation between two triplets at a time. We present a novel approach for batch mode active metric learning using the Maximum Entropy Principle that seeks to collectively select batches with maximum *joint entropy*, which captures both the informativeness *and* the diversity of the triplets. The entropy is derived from the second order statistics estimated by dropout. We take advantage of the monotonically increasing submodular entropy function to construct an efficient greedy algorithm based on Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization that is provably  $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -optimal. Our approach is the first batch-mode active metric learning method to define a unified score that balances informativeness and diversity for an entire batch of triplets. Experiments with several real-world datasets demonstrate that our algorithm is robust and consistently outperforms the state-of-the-art.

## Introduction

Understanding similarity between two objects is fundamental to many vision and machine learning tasks, e.g. object retrieval (Ge 2018), clustering (Xing et al. 2003) and classification (Weinberger and Saul 2009). Most existing methods model a *discrete* measure of similarity based on class labels: two samples are considered similar if they belong to the same class, even though their features may be quite distinct, and dissimilar otherwise. But human estimation of perceptual similarity is often more fine-grained. We may choose, for example, *continuous* measures such as the *degree* of perceived similarity in taste or visual appearance for comparing two food dishes, rather than discrete categorical labels. Thus it is important to build a *continuous* perceptual space to model human-perceived similarity between objects. Recent studies demonstrate the importance of perceptual metrics in several tasks in computer vision and cognitive science (Zhang et al. 2018; Kim et al. 2019; Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019).

Early work on perceptual metric learning focuses on non-parametric methods (e.g. MDS) which use numerical measurements of pairwise similarity for training. These are hard to gather and suffer from inconsistency. Instead, similarity *comparisons* of the form “Is object  $x_i$  more similar to object  $x_j$  than object  $x_k$ ?” are easier to gather and more stable (Kendall 1948). They form a useful foundation for several tasks, including perceptual metric learning. However, the number of possible triplets of  $n$  objects is  $O(n^3)$ , making it infeasible to label even a significant fraction of them. Fortunately, many triplets are redundant and we can effectively model the metric using only a few triplets. Thus it is imperative to identify and annotate a subset of high-quality triplets that are jointly informative for the model, *without* knowing the annotations of any triplets in advance.

Active learning is a standard technique that addresses this issue by iteratively identifying small batches of informative samples and soliciting labels for them. While extensively studied for class label-based learning tasks, there exists very little literature (Tamuz et al. 2011; Heim et al. 2015; Kumari et al. 2020) on active learning which focuses on perceptual metric learning task. Further, these works merely assess the informativeness of *individual* triplets with uncertainty measures, which assumes a triplet with high prediction uncertainty is more crucial to label. Although effective in many scenarios, such an uncertainty measure makes a myopic decision based solely on the current model’s prediction and fails to capture triplets’ collective distribution as a whole. Independently assessed triplets may themselves have much redundancy even if they are individually informative. Hence the triplets should be not merely informative but also *diverse* or *decorrelated*. Kumari et al. (Kumari et al. 2020) proposed a method for selecting informative *and* decorrelated batches of triplets for active metric learning. However, (Kumari et al. 2020) suffers from three major limitations: (1) The active learning strategy is based on a two stage process for informativeness (choice of a larger batchpool) and diversity (subsequent trimming of the batchpool), applied sequentially. It does not always ensure an optimal tradeoff between the two criteria. (2) The proposed diversity measures are all ad-hoc with no principled connection to informativeness. Being heuristic, no single measure works consistently well in all cases, making it harder for an user to select. (3) Selection of triplets based on informativeness being a post-

processing technique, introduces a bias in the latter because of suboptimal batch selection in prior iterations.

To mitigate these issues, we propose a new batch mode active learning algorithm developed specifically for triplet-based metric learning. Our **key insight** is to express a set of (unannotated) triplets as a vector of random variables, and select batches of triplets that maximize the *joint entropy* measure. Thus, instead of separately expressing and optimizing informativeness for individual triplets and diversity for pairs of triplets, we develop a single probabilistic informativeness measure *for a batch of triplets*. We also provide efficient approximate solutions with provable guarantees. Specifically, our main technical contributions are:

1. We propose to use the joint entropy of the distribution of triplet margins to rank a batch of unannotated triplets. We estimate the second-order statistics of *triplet margins* by randomly perturbing the current model trained on prior batches as in (Gal and Ghahramani 2016), to characterize the distribution.
2. Using the Maximum Entropy Principle, we arrive at a gaussian distribution compatible with given empirical mean and covariance, whose entropy is characterized by the determinant of the covariance matrix. As exact maximization of the entropy is prohibitively expensive (there are  $\binom{m}{b}$  possible batches of size  $b$  from  $m$  triplets), we use the fact that entropy is monotone increasing and submodular to justify a greedy policy which is provably  $(1 - 1/e)$ -optimal (Nemhauser, Wolsey, and Fisher 1978).
3. We achieve further computational efficiency by utilizing the properties of a Gram matrix. The greedy policy is implemented recursively as the maximization of successive projection errors of a set of vectors, picked one at a time, when projected onto the span of previous choices. This amounts to successive maximization of the conditional entropy, and is easily implemented using Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach through extensive experiments on data in different modalities (image, taste and haptic). In addition to having a sound theoretical justification, our method provides a significant performance gain over the current state-of-the-art.

## Related Work

The prior work can be roughly divided into three categories. We review representative techniques in each and discuss how our work differs from the existing methods.

### Perceptual Metric Learning

While there is extensive recent research on distance metric learning, most of the algorithms are specific to class-based learning tasks such as classification (Weinberger and Saul 2009), object recognition (Ying and Li 2012) and clustering (Xing et al. 2003), which consider two objects similar if they belong to the same class. See Bellet *et al.* (Bellet, Habrard, and Sebban 2013) for a comprehensive review. In contrast, our goal is to define a perceptual distance that

captures the degree of similarity between any two objects irrespective of their classes. Recently, a whole new literature has emerged that emphasizes the importance of learning such continuous measures of similarity for various applications, e.g. for measuring image similarity (Wang et al. 2004; Wang, Simoncelli, and Bovik 2003; Zhang et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2014), face recognition (Fan et al. 2019), concept learning (Wah, Maji, and Belongie 2015; Wang et al. 2014; Wilber et al. 2015) and perceptual embedding of objects (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019; Jamieson and Nowak 2011; Van Der Maaten and Weinberger 2012; Agarwal et al. 2007). The closest application to ours is perceptual embedding of objects, where the embedding function is learned so as to model the human-perceived inter-object similarity. While multidimensional scaling (MDS) techniques have been extensively applied for this (Jamieson and Nowak 2011; Agarwal et al. 2007; Kruskal and Wish 1978), they are non-parametric and require numerical similarity measurement as inputs, which are hard to gather (Kendall 1948). Recent works (Zhang et al. 2018; McFee and Lanckriet 2011; Van Der Maaten and Weinberger 2012) address these limitations by developing parametric models using non-numeric relative comparisons. A relevant method is the triplet-based deep metric learning method of Kumari *et al.* (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019). Although our method borrows base metric learning architectures from (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019), (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019) doesn't aim to make the metric learning algorithm data-efficient by developing an active data sampling technique.

### Active Learning for Classification

Active learning (AL) techniques have been well explored for different vision and learning tasks, see Settles (Settles 2012) for a detailed review of active learning methods for class-based learning. Typically, the AL methods select a single instance with the maximum individual utility for annotation in each iteration. The utility of an instance is decided by different heuristics, e.g. uncertainty sampling (Yang et al. 2017; Kumari et al. 2020), query-by-committee (QBC) (Gilad-Bachrach, Navot, and Tishby 2006), expected gradient length (EGL) (Huang et al. 2016; Ash et al. 2020), and model-output-change (MOC) (Freytag, Rodner, and Denzler 2014; Käding et al. 2018). The simplest and most widely applicable uncertainty sampling approach has been extended to modern deep learning frameworks (Gal, Islam, and Ghahramani 2017) and variational inference (Sinha, Ebrahimi, and Darrell 2019). However, in all these methods, each sample's utility is evaluated independently without considering dependence between them.

In batch-mode active learning, data items are assessed not one at a time but in batches, to reduce the number of times the model is retrained. To avoid selecting correlated batches, some recent attempts evaluate the whole batch's utility by taking mutual information between samples into account. In contrast to our work, most of them are developed for classification tasks (Ash et al. 2020; Kirsch, van Amersfoort, and Gal 2019; Sener and Savarese 2018). For example, Kirch *et al.* (Kirsch, van Amersfoort, and Gal 2019) define the util-

ity score as the mutual information between data points in a batch and model parameters and then pick a subset with the maximum score. Pinsler *et al.* (Pinsler et al. 2019) formulate the active learning problem as a sparse subset selection problem approximating the complete data posterior of the model parameters. Both methods have a similar motivation to our work, but they are developed for the classification task, and their informativeness measures are not easy to extend to the metric learning task. Ash *et al.* (Ash et al. 2020) use the norm of the gradient at a sample to capture both informativeness and diversity, and select a subset of the farthest samples in the gradient space. This ensures both informativeness and diversity by a single gradient-based measure, which does not work well in the metric learning task, as shown by Kumari *et al.* (Kumari et al. 2020). Sener and Savarese (Sener and Savarese 2018) follow a similar strategy in a different feature space.

## Active Learning of Perceptual Metric

There are only a few works on active learning for training a perceptual metric. Most of these, e.g. (Tamuz et al. 2011; Heim et al. 2015), are based on a single instance evaluation criterion. They define the utility of a single triplet and select a batch of the individually highest-utility triplets to annotate. In contrast, we define a utility score for a batch taking joint information between triplets into account. The closest work to ours is a very recent paper by Kumari *et al.* (Kumari et al. 2020). The algorithm involves a two-stage process. First, it selects a batch of individually highly informative samples and then reduces the correlation in the selected batch using different triplet-based decorrelation heuristics. This method, in essence, is still based on a single triplet selection strategy. In contrast, we present a new rigorous approach to define utility for a batch as a whole based on *joint entropy*, providing a unified utility function to balance both informativeness and diversity.

## Proposed Method

In this section, we first briefly describe the perceptual metric learning setup, as well as the underlying neural network-based learner called PerceptNet (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019). Next, we introduce our novel batch selection algorithm explicitly developed for triplet-based active metric learning.

### Triplet-Based Active Metric Learning

Let  $X = \{x_i\}_1^n$  represent a set of  $n$  objects, each described by a  $d$ -D feature vector  $x_i$ . Also, let  $T_L$  be a set of ordered triplets, where each triplet  $(x_i, x_j, x_k)$  indicates that the object  $x_i$  is more similar to object  $x_j$  than to  $x_k$ . In perceptual metric learning, our goal is to learn an embedding function  $\phi : R^d \rightarrow R^{\hat{d}}$  such that the Euclidean distance between any two objects in the embedding space  $d_\phi(x, y) = \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\|$  reflects the perceptual distance between them. In recent work,  $\phi$  is typically modeled with a neural network: in our experiments, we choose the existing PerceptNet model (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019), where three copies of the same network, with shared

weights, process three objects  $x_i$ ,  $x_j$  and  $x_k$  during training. The output is optimized with an exponential triplet loss  $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{T_L} e^{-(d_\phi^2(x_i, x_k) - d_\phi^2(x_i, x_j))}$  to maximize the distance margins (equivalently, ‘triplet margin’), as defined by the exponent, for training triplets.

The number of possible triplets is cubic in the number of objects, so annotating a significant fraction of them is often intractable, e.g. in domains such as haptics and food testing where annotation is especially slow. However, the triplets can be very redundant, so the embedding can be modeled with far fewer comparisons if triplets are sampled selectively based on *how much information* they provide. This calls for active learning. The model is trained iteratively: batches of triplets informative to the current model are selected for annotation in each iteration, after which the model is retrained. However, the efficiency gain of selecting larger batches may be undone by *correlation* among triplets in a batch implying low overall information, a common issue in independent optimization of individual informativeness of each triplet. To mitigate this, prior works have studied *batch decorrelation* strategies for classification (Kirsch, van Amersfoort, and Gal 2019; Ash et al. 2020; Pinsler et al. 2019). Recently, Kumari *et al.* (Kumari et al. 2020) developed a decorrelation strategy for metric learning with separate steps for optimizing individual triplet informativeness and then batch diversity within the chosen subset. However, as already noted, this work suffers from limitations related to the design choices. In contrast, we develop a method that jointly defines and optimizes the informativeness of an entire batch while implicitly ensuring diversity. The method is grounded in the Maximum Entropy Principle and leads to an attractive computational scheme.

## Joint Entropy Measure for Batch Selection

The key to a good batch mode active learning is an effective informativeness measure for a batch of triplets. For tractability, earlier work typically defines a measure that adds up the individual informativeness scores of triplets. A popular and effective score is the prediction uncertainty of the current model trained on prior batches defined as the Shannon entropy of the prediction probability  $p_y$  for a triplet  $t$  taking one of two possible orderings  $y \in \{ijk, ijk\}$ ,  $H(t) = -\sum_{y \in \{ijk, ijk\}} p_y \log p_y$  (the probability is defined as a function of the predicted triplet embedding (Tamuz et al. 2011)). However, individually high-entropy triplets may also have high mutual information, hence simply adding up the scores may overestimate the actual utility of the batch.

We propose a novel batch selection algorithm based on *joint entropy* of an entire batch of triplets  $B$ , capturing their mutual dependence. We define the joint probability distribution of a set of unannotated triplets on some feature space such as their distance margins. This probability is defined over the space of *likely models* given prior batches, reducing any bias due to model training (contrast with the prediction uncertainty of a single fixed model described above). The joint distribution over a set of triplets naturally captures the notion of interdependence among them.

## Maximum-Entropy Model of the Joint Distribution

Our goal is to postulate the joint probability distribution of unannotated triplets in a batch, preferably in a form that allows efficient computation of its entropy. We represent each triplet  $t$  by its distance margin  $\xi_t = d_\phi^2(x_i, x_k) - d_\phi^2(x_i, x_j)$ : a batch  $B = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_b\}$  is thus represented by the vector of distance margins  $\vec{\xi}_B = [\xi_{t_1}, \xi_{t_2}, \dots, \xi_{t_b}]$ .<sup>1</sup> We assume the model to be uncertain about these margin predictions, hence the distance margin vector  $\xi_{t_i}$  is a  $K$ -dimensional random variable taking different values for different choices of model parameters  $\phi$ . Simply looking at the predicted ordering probabilities of individual triplet is both error-prone and fails to consider correlation between triplets. Fortunately, if the model is a neural network, it has been shown that random dropout yields a good Bayesian approximation of model uncertainty (Gal and Ghahramani 2016). We stochastically apply the dropout  $K$  times to the model, evaluating  $\vec{\xi}_B$  each time, to sample the joint distribution of the batch and to compute the corresponding mean and covariance matrix. We invoke the Maximum Entropy Principle (Jaynes 1957) which maximizes the Shannon entropy subject to constraints on prescribed averages. Empirical estimates of the entropy of the batch from samples are susceptible to noise and lead to hard combinatorial optimization over batches. So we constrain the mean and covariance matrix of the triplet margins to match their empirical values  $\vec{\mu}_B$  and  $\Sigma_B$  and maximize the differential entropy  $H(B) = - \int p(\vec{\xi}_B) \log p(\vec{\xi}_B) d\vec{\xi}_B$  subject to these constraints. This leads to multivariate gaussian distribution  $N(\vec{\mu}_B, \Sigma_B)$  with entropy

$$\frac{1}{2} \log ((2\pi e)^b \det(\Sigma_B)) \quad (1)$$

Note that this score takes into account inter-triplet correlation, unlike measures depending only on individual marginals. The next task is to efficiently select an optimum batch of size  $b$  with maximum informativeness:  $B^* = \arg \max_{B \subset T_U, |B|=b} H(B)$ , where  $T_U$  is the set of currently unannotated triplets.

## Greedy Algorithm for Batch Selection

Since the maximization of the joint entropy function  $H(B)$  over subsets is computationally prohibitive, we use the fact that entropy is monotone increasing and submodular to justify a greedy policy which is provably  $(1 - 1/e)$ -optimal by the results of Nemhauser *et al.* (Nemhauser, Wolsey, and Fisher 1978). The greedy algorithm builds up the set  $B^*$  incrementally. In step  $k$ , we pick the triplet  $t_k$  which has maximum conditional entropy given triplets  $B_{k-1}$  selected

<sup>1</sup>Other triplet based representations are possible: we found the above to be a consistent and more useful feature in practice.

---

### Algorithm 1 Greedy algorithm to maximize $H(B)$

---

**Input:** Unlabeled triplets  $T_U$ , batch size  $b$ , an entropy function  $H : 2^{T_U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  described by Eq. 1.

**Output:** A batch  $B$  that is a  $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation to  $\arg \max_{B \subset T_U, |B|=b} H(B)$ .

- 1:  $B_0 \leftarrow \emptyset, H(B_0) = 0$
  - 2: **for**  $k=1, \dots, b$  **do**
  - 3:    $t_k \leftarrow \arg \max_{t \in T_U \setminus B_{k-1}} \log \left( \frac{\det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1} \cup \{t\}})}{\det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1}})} \right)$
  - 4:    $B_k \leftarrow B_{k-1} \cup \{t_k\}$
  - 5: **end for**
  - 6: **return** Final subset  $B_k$
- 

in previous steps. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} t_k &= \arg \max_{t \in T_U \setminus B_{k-1}} H(B_{k-1} \cup \{t\} \mid B_{k-1}) \\ &= \arg \max_{t \in T_U \setminus B_{k-1}} H(B_{k-1} \cup \{t\}) - H(B_{k-1}) \\ &= \arg \max_{t \in T_U \setminus B_{k-1}} \log \left( \frac{\det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1} \cup \{t\}})}{\det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1}})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This step is repeated  $|T_U|$  times. The greedy policy has low complexity (quantified later) and scales well to large datasets. The overall batch selection algorithm is listed in 1. The remaining challenge is to efficiently compute the increment in the determinant of the covariance matrix in each step. We present a recursive algorithm for this, which also clarifies why the method selects a decorrelated batch.

## Recursive Computation of Determinant of Covariance Matrix

The covariance matrix is a Gram matrix, i.e. its  $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$  element can be written as the dot product of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  vectors from a given family of vectors. This allows the greedy policy to recursively compute its determinant. Let  $u_t$  denote the zero-mean vector of all sampled distance margins,  $[\xi_t(\phi_1), \dots, \xi_t(\phi_K)] - [\mu_t, \dots, \mu_t]$ , for a single triplet  $t$ . The covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{B_{k-1}}$  has the form  $U U^T$ , where each column of  $U$  is  $u_s, s \in B_{k-1}$ . In the  $k^{\text{th}}$  step, a new row and column vector for a new triplet  $t$  are appended to  $U$ . Using the Gram matrix property, we have  $\det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1} \cup \{t\}}) - \det(\Sigma_{B_{k-1}}) = \|\tilde{u}_k\|^2$ , where  $\tilde{u}_k$  is the normal from  $u_t$  onto  $\text{span}\{u_s \mid s \in B_{k-1}\}$ . Thus the greedy scheme successively maximizes the squared projection error  $\|\tilde{u}_k\|^2$ , over the remaining vectors  $\{u_t \mid t \in T_U \setminus B_{k-1}\}$ . Thus we select at each step the triplet that is least correlated with the already chosen triplets. The orthogonal projections are computed using the modified Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization scheme from (Hoffmann 1989), with complexity  $d n^2$ , where  $d$  is the dimension of the ambient vector space and  $n$  the number of vectors. Since we compute the projection error for all  $|T_U| - n \approx |T_U|$  remaining triplets at each step (because  $|T_U| \gg n$ ), the overall complexity of the scheme is  $d n^2 |T_U|$ .

## Experiments

We perform several experiments to answer the following two questions: (1) Is our method competitive with standard baselines, including the state-of-the-art method(s), for different choices of hyperparameters, feature dimension, and across different types of datasets? (2) How robust is our method to labeling error? We address these questions by conducting several experiments on real-world datasets with different modalities: image, food and haptic. For each of these datasets, we select an appropriate neural network architecture – for the haptic and food datasets we ensure that these architectures exactly match those of Kumari et al. (Kumari et al. 2020) so that the comparison is fair ((Kumari et al. 2020) did not present any result on images, requiring us to implement their method on image databases). We test with different initial pools and varying batch sizes. We also simulated random errors in the triplet orderings to test robustness to labeling error. Some additional results and details are presented in supplementary material.

**Datasets.** We evaluate the performance of our method on four real-world datasets: Yummly food dataset (Wilber, Kwak, and Belongie 2014); TUM haptic texture dataset (Strese, Boeck, and Steinbach 2017); Abstract500 image dataset (Robb et al. 2015), and CUB-200 image dataset (Welinder et al. 2010). The Yummly-Food dataset has 72148 triplets defined over 73 food items based on taste similarity. The feature of each food item is represented by a 6D vector (i.e., an experiment with low feature dimension) with each component indicating different taste properties. We use 20K training and 20K test triplets sampled from the entire set of triplets. The TUM-Haptic dataset contains signals from 108 different types of surface materials. Each type of material has 32-D spectral feature vectors for 10 representative acceleration traces. The triplets are generated from a given ground-truth perceptual matrix, which has user-recorded perceived similarity responses. Like the Yummly-Food dataset, we have training and test sets of 20K triplets each. We also evaluate our method on a comparatively larger dataset (but relatively small for image data), the Abstract500 image dataset (Robb et al. 2015), which contains 500 images of  $128 \times 128$  pixels, with pairwise perceptual similarities between them. Each image is represented by a 512-D GIST feature (an example of relatively high dimensional feature vector) extracted using 32 Gabor filters at four scales and eight orientations (Oliva and Torralba 2001). We use this perceptual matrix to again generate 20K training and 20K test triplets. Finally we use a much larger and popular CUB-200 bird database that contains 200 bird species with roughly 30 images in each class. We choose five representative images for each class and generate its features using a pretrained ResNeXt-101-32x8d model. The network takes segmented images as input and outputs 2048-D feature vectors. The training and test sets each have 10K triplets sampled from the entire set of 93530 triplets.

**Baselines.** We compare our method with five baselines, including the state-of-the-art method: (1) **US- $\langle$ Dist $\rangle$ :** A batch of individually high-entropy triplets is pruned subjected to different (denoted by  $\langle$ Dist $\rangle$ ) decorrelation measures to select a diverse batch of informative triplets (Kumari et al. 2020). It is the current state-of-the-art for batch mode active metric learning, and outperforms other alternatives like BADGE (Ash et al. 2020) (adapted to metric learning). (2) **Variance:** Triplets with the highest individual distance-margin variance across a collection of models generated using dropout (Kendall, Badrinarayanan, and Cipolla 2015). This method simulates the effect of replacing the joint entropy of a batch with the sum of individual entropies of triplets in the batch. (3) **Random:** A passive learning strategy that uniformly samples each batch of triplets at random. Though naïve, this choice often results in reasonably good accuracy. (4) **US:** Uncertainty method, which picks the top  $b$  triplets with highest uncertainty in predicted triplet ordering (i.e. the model’s (lack of) ordering confidence), without taking correlation among them into account (Tamuz et al. 2011). (5) **BADGE:** A diverse set of triplets with maximum loss gradients for the most probable label, selected using k-means ((Ash et al. 2020) adapted to the triplet scenario).

**Active Learning Setup.** For the CUB-200 dataset, we begin each experiment with an initial pool of 1000 annotated triplets, and for the other three datasets with 600 annotated triplets, and pretrain the model  $\phi_0$ , which is used as a common starting point for all compared methods. In each active learning iteration, we select the best fixed-size batch of unannotated triplets, using the chosen batch selection method, and acquire their orderings. To make convergence faster, we update the current model  $\phi_i$  to obtain  $\phi_{i+1}$  using the available additional annotated triplets instead of training *ab initio*. The performance of the learned model is evaluated by its *triplet generalization accuracy*, which denotes the fraction of triplets whose ordering is correctly predicted (Kumari, Chaudhuri, and Chaudhuri 2019). Each experiment is repeated with five random train/test splits, and the average performance along with the standard deviation is reported. (The standard deviation is shown in supplementary material, for clarity.)

**Implementation Details.** The architecture and training hyperparameters used for different datasets are as follows; Yummly-Food: 3 fully-connected (FC) layers with 6, 12 and 12 neurons; TUM-Haptic: 4 FC layers with 32, 32, 64 and 32 neurons; Abstract500-Image: 6 FC layers with 512, 256, 128, 64, 32 and 16 neurons; CUB-200: 3 FC layers with 2048, 512 and 32 neurons. Each layer is followed by a dropout layer with a dropout probability of 0.02. The Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba 2015) is used for training all models with a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$  for Yummly-Food, TUM-Haptic, and Abstract500-Image dataset and  $10^{-5}$  for CUB-200 dataset. The model is trained with an SGD batch size of 500 for 1000 epochs for all four datasets.




Figure 1: Performance of different active learning methods on two image datasets CUB-200 and Abstract500 for increasing batch sizes (400/600/800 or 200/500/800, from left to right). Here accuracy means what fraction of test triplets have been detected with the correct ordering. To avoid clutter, standard deviations are shown only for the CUB-200 dataset and rest are shown in the supplementary material.

**Active Learning Performance.** The performance of our method against the baselines described earlier is plotted in Fig 1 for the image datasets CUB-200 and Abstract500-Image, shown as a function of the number of active learning iterations. In Fig 2, we compare the performances of all methods for the data from other modalities, i.e., haptic and food. We observe that our method is consistently better than the state-of-the-art **US-<Dist>** method (for clarity, we only show the specific variant offering the best performance in each experiment). Our method reaches higher accuracies quicker and also tends to converge to a higher final accuracy on both Yummly-Food and TUM-Haptic datasets. For the large CUB-200 image dataset, our method is neck-and-neck with the state-of-the-art for the first few iterations and then rapidly overtakes it, widening the gap with additional iterations. For the smaller Abstract500 image dataset, the improvements are more prominent with larger batch sizes, reflecting the focus of our work on batch-mode learning. Additionally, for the CUB-200 dataset, we plot the standard deviation in the same plot as the shaded region (of the same color) around the performance curves for different methods (standard deviations on other datasets are shown in supplementary). Even though the figure looks a little cluttered, one can see that the standard deviation for the proposed method is better than that of the next-best method, signifying a more consistent performance. This substantiates our claim that joint entropy is a better batch score than an ad-hoc combination of independent informativeness and diversity heuristics. Further, our method does not require the user to select

a suitable decorrelation heuristic to manually fine-tune the performance.

We also outperform the other two baselines: **Random** and **Variance**. It is particularly informative to see the generally poor performance of **Variance** (lower than random sampling). Because of high correlations among informative triplets, individually selecting the most informative triplets does not learn the entire metric space as well as just picking triplets at random. In contrast, our method as well as that of Kumari *et al.* (Kumari et al. 2020) both incorporate batch decorrelation and outperform random sampling. This shows the critical importance of batch diversity in an active learning strategy.

**Ablation Study.** It was mentioned in Section 3.2 that in order to get an estimate of the covariance matrix, we perform random dropouts in the neural network  $K$  times. Naturally, as  $K$  increases, one gets a better estimate of the covariance matrix. However, this may increase the computation time. As a matter of fact, this is the only hyperparameter required in the proposed method. We perform an ablation study to see how this hyperparameter (i.e., variation in  $K$ ) affects the triplet generalization accuracy, and the results are shown in Fig 3 for three different modalities: image, haptic and food. It can be seen from the plots that for the image and haptic datasets, a moderate value of about  $K = 70$  or  $100$  is good enough as the performance is not significantly dependent on the choice of  $K$ ; however, there is a significant variation for




Figure 2: Performance of different active learning methods on Yummly-Food and TUM-Haptic texture datasets for varying batch sizes (500/800/1000 or 400/600/800). Standard deviations are omitted here for clarity, but shown in supplementary material.

the Yummly-Food dataset, with optimal  $K = 100$ .




Figure 3: Ablation study to analyze the performance of our method for different values of  $K$  (# of prior models sampled by dropout) on image, haptic and food modalities.

We also compare the computational requirement of the proposed method with that of Kumari *et al.* (Kumari et al. 2020). The key computational step in (Kumari et al. 2020) involves searching for the subset of maximally apart (in the feature space) triplet at each iteration, apart from the computation of the gradients. They also use a greedy search technique for subset selection. For the proposed method, the sub-




Figure 4: QQ plot for all four datasets, to demonstrate how good is our assumption that the mean and covariance are sufficient statistics for the chosen triplet margin features.

set selection process is efficient, but the computation of covariance at each iteration does consume a good amount of time. Overall, both the methods were found to consume a nearly equal amount of computation time when the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization is used.

We now study the validity of the gaussian embedding, though it already has justification as ‘worst case analysis’ due to the Maximum Entropy Principle. A standard test is the quantile-quantile (QQ) plot (Ben and Yohai 2004), which indicates how close the empirical distribution is to the theoretical distribution. In Fig 4, for ease of visualization, we




Figure 5: Performance of the proposed method vs the random sampling strategy in presence of annotation error.

show the QQ plot for a single randomly-selected unlabeled triplet, for a particular model trained on the initial triplet pool in each dataset. (We cannot visualize a full multivariate QQ plot over all possible batches.) The x-axis denotes the theoretical quantiles, which in our case is for a Gaussian distribution with the estimated empirical mean and variance, and the ordered distance margin values are on the y-axis. The *goodness of fit* is indicated by the alignment of points on the graph with the straight line having a unit slope. From the computed QQ plots in Fig 4, one can observe that in all four datasets, the plotted curve closely approximates the corresponding straight lines given in red.

**Robustness to Labeling Error.** To evaluate the robustness of our method against labeling error, we corrupt 10% and 30% of the ground-truth training triplets in the food dataset by flipping their orders. Figure 5 shows how the noisy training set affects the performance of our method vs. the random sampling baseline. With a relatively low 10% labeling error, our method takes slightly more number of iterations to gain accuracy, but eventually converges to a comparable high accuracy as the noise-free case, while the random sampling method fails to achieve the same performance even at lower level of perturbations in the data. As the percentage of noisy triplets increases, the performance of both methods degrade, showing vulnerability to large scale labeling error. In the absence of abnormally high levels of outliers, our method shows robust performance.

## Conclusion

We have introduced a novel approach for batch mode active metric learning based on maximizing the joint entropy of a batch. We found that a batch of individually informative triplets does not form an optimal subset, even if decorrelation heuristics are applied to reduce their correlation. Instead of defining separate measures for informativeness and diversity, our method defines the joint entropy of a batch of triplets as a unified measure that jointly optimizes both. We achieve this first by determining the most entropic joint probability distribution of triplets in the distance margin

space that matches the empirical second order statistics, using the Maximum Entropy Principle, and then maximize its entropy over subsets of triplets. To make the batch selection problem tractable, we use a greedy algorithm with provable guarantees, that iteratively constructs an approximately optimal batch by adding one triplet in each step with the maximum conditional entropy given the already chosen triplets. We propose an efficient recursive scheme for computing the conditional entropy of the next triplet. The overall method involves no heuristic parameter selection and has no control parameter to tweak, other than the number of dropout samples, once the network architecture is chosen. Extensive experimental results on four disparate real-world datasets demonstrate that the proposed method consistently outperforms the state-of-the-art.

## References

- Agarwal, S.; Wills, J.; Cayton, L.; Lanckriet, G.; Kriegman, D.; and Belongie, S. 2007. Generalized non-metric multidimensional scaling. In *AIS*.
- Ash, J. T.; Zhang, C.; Krishnamurthy, A.; Langford, J.; and Agarwal, A. 2020. Deep Batch Active Learning by Diverse, Uncertain Gradient Lower Bounds. In *ICLR*.
- Bellet, A.; Habrard, A.; and Sebban, M. 2013. A survey on metric learning for feature vectors and structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6709* .
- Ben, M. G.; and Yohai, V. J. 2004. Quantile–quantile plot for deviance residuals in the generalized linear model. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* .
- Fan, D.-P.; Zhang, S.; Wu, Y.-H.; Liu, Y.; Cheng, M.-M.; Ren, B.; Rosin, P. L.; and Ji, R. 2019. Scoot: A perceptual metric for facial sketches. In *ICCV*.
- Freytag, A.; Rodner, E.; and Denzler, J. 2014. Selecting influential examples: Active learning with expected model output changes. In *ECCV*.
- Gal, Y.; and Ghahramani, Z. 2016. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *ICML*.
- Gal, Y.; Islam, R.; and Ghahramani, Z. 2017. Deep Bayesian active learning with image data. In *ICML*.
- Ge, W. 2018. Deep metric learning with hierarchical triplet loss. In *ECCV*.
- Gilad-Bachrach, R.; Navot, A.; and Tishby, N. 2006. Query by committee made real. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- Heim, E.; Berger, M.; Seversky, L.; and Hauskrecht, M. 2015. Active perceptual similarity modeling with auxiliary information. In *AAAI*.
- Hoffmann, W. 1989. Iterative algorithms for Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization. *Computing* .
- Huang, J.; Child, R.; Rao, V.; Liu, H.; Satheesh, S.; and Coates, A. 2016. Active learning for speech recognition: the power of gradients. In *NeurIPS*.

- Jamieson, K. G.; and Nowak, R. D. 2011. Low-dimensional embedding using adaptively selected ordinal data. In *Allerton*.
- Jaynes, E. T. 1957. Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics. *Physical Review*.
- Käding, C.; Rodner, E.; Freytag, A.; Mothes, O.; Barz, B.; Denzler, J.; and AG, C. Z. 2018. Active Learning for Regression Tasks with Expected Model Output Changes. In *BMVC*.
- Kendall, A.; Badrinarayanan, V.; and Cipolla, R. 2015. Bayesian segnet: Model uncertainty in deep convolutional encoder-decoder architectures for scene understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02680*.
- Kendall, M. G. 1948. *Rank correlation methods*. Griffin.
- Kim, S.; Seo, M.; Laptev, I.; Cho, M.; and Kwak, S. 2019. Deep metric learning beyond binary supervision. In *CVPR*.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2015. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR*.
- Kirsch, A.; van Amersfoort, J.; and Gal, Y. 2019. BatchBALD: Efficient and Diverse Batch Acquisition for Deep Bayesian Active Learning. In *NeurIPS*.
- Kruskal, J. B.; and Wish, M. 1978. *Multidimensional scaling*. Elsevier.
- Kumari, P.; Chaudhuri, S.; and Chaudhuri, S. 2019. PerceptNet: Learning Perceptual Similarity of Haptic Textures in Presence of Unorderable Triplets. In *WHC*.
- Kumari, P.; Goru, R.; Chaudhuri, S.; and Chaudhuri, S. 2020. Batch Decorrelation for Active Metric Learning. In *IJCAI-PRICAI*.
- McFee, B.; and Lanckriet, G. 2011. Learning multi-modal similarity. *JMLR*.
- Nemhauser, G. L.; Wolsey, L. A.; and Fisher, M. L. 1978. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions – I. *Mathematical programming*.
- Oliva, A.; and Torralba, A. 2001. Modeling the shape of the scene: A holistic representation of the spatial envelope. *IJCV*.
- Pinsler, R.; Gordon, J.; Nalisnick, E.; and Hernández-Lobato, J. M. 2019. Bayesian batch active learning as sparse subset approximation. In *NeurIPS*.
- Robb, D. A.; Padilla, S.; Kalkreuter, B.; and J.Chantler, M. 2015. Crowdsourced feedback with imagery rather than text: Would designers use it? In *SIGCHI*.
- Sener, O.; and Savarese, S. 2018. Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach. In *ICLR*.
- Settles, B. 2012. Active learning. *SLAIML*.
- Sinha, S.; Ebrahimi, S.; and Darrell, T. 2019. Variational Adversarial Active Learning. In *ICCV*.
- Strese, M.; Boeck, Y.; and Steinbach, E. 2017. Content-based surface material retrieval. In *WHC*.
- Tamuz, O.; Liu, C.; Belongie, S.; Shamir, O.; and Kalai, A. T. 2011. Adaptively learning the crowd kernel. In *ICML*.
- Van Der Maaten, L.; and Weinberger, K. 2012. Stochastic triplet embedding. In *IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing*.
- Wah, C.; Maji, S.; and Belongie, S. 2015. Learning localized perceptual similarity metrics for interactive categorization. In *WACV*.
- Wang, J.; Song, Y.; Leung, T.; Rosenberg, C.; Wang, J.; Philbin, J.; Chen, B.; and Wu, Y. 2014. Learning fine-grained image similarity with deep ranking. In *CVPR*.
- Wang, Z.; Bovik, A. C.; Sheikh, H. R.; and Simoncelli, E. P. 2004. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*.
- Wang, Z.; Simoncelli, E. P.; and Bovik, A. C. 2003. Multi-scale structural similarity for image quality assessment. In *The Thirty-Seventh Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems & Computers, 2003*.
- Weinberger, K. Q.; and Saul, L. K. 2009. Distance metric learning for large margin nearest neighbor classification. *JMLR*.
- Welinder, P.; Branson, S.; Mita, T.; Wah, C.; Schroff, F.; Belongie, S.; and Perona, P. 2010. Caltech-UCSD Birds 200. Technical Report CNS-TR-2010-001, California Institute of Technology.
- Wilber, M.; Kwak, I. S.; Kriegman, D.; and Belongie, S. 2015. Learning concept embeddings with combined human-machine expertise. In *ICCV*.
- Wilber, M. J.; Kwak, I. S.; and Belongie, S. J. 2014. Cost-effective hits for relative similarity comparisons. In *AAAI*.
- Xing, E. P.; Jordan, M. I.; Russell, S. J.; and Ng, A. Y. 2003. Distance metric learning with application to clustering with side-information. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- Yang, L.; Zhang, Y.; Chen, J.; Zhang, S.; and Chen, D. Z. 2017. Suggestive annotation: A deep active learning framework for biomedical image segmentation. In *MICCAI*.
- Ying, Y.; and Li, P. 2012. Distance metric learning with eigenvalue optimization. *JMLR*.
- Zhang, R.; Isola, P.; Efros, A. A.; Shechtman, E.; and Wang, O. 2018. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *CVPR*.

# Maximizing Conditional Entropy for Batch-Mode Active Learning of Perceptual Metrics (*Supplementary Material*)

In this supplementary material, we provide (a) plots with standard deviations for three datasets where only the mean accuracies were provided in the main paper, for clarity; (b) additional tests to suggest that modeling conditional distributions with Gaussians based on empirical second order statistics is justified; and (c) qualitative and quantitative results on a retrieval task with metrics trained with different methods.

In Figure 1, we augment the plots shown in the main paper with standard error bands across the five experimental runs for each method+hyperparameter combination for three real-world datasets: Abstract500-Image, Yummly-Food, and TUM-Haptic. (Bands for CUB-200 are directly shown in the main paper.) The standard error of our method is small for all datasets except the Yummly-Food dataset, where all methods have high variance. While our method always exceeds or matches the best alternative, the performance gain is observed to be higher for a larger batch size.




Figure 1: Mean accuracy and standard deviation plots (computed over five random train/test splits) of different active learning methods for Abstract500-Image, Yummly-Food and TUM-Haptic datasets with increasing batch sizes.

## Comparison of Data Distribution to Theoretical Distribution

In Figure 2, we compare our data distribution with a theoretical distribution obtained using the maximum entropy principle. The green curve shows the theoretical Gaussian distribution with parameters matching the empirical second-order statistics (mean and covariance) of triplet margins over perturbation of the first trained model (i.e. trained on the initial pool of triplets). Due to the limitation of the visualization of high-dimensional data, we show the margin distributions of two randomly-selected triplets for each dataset. As shown in Figure 2, our data distribution shows a reasonable fit with the theoretical distribution for the most part, except that the actual distribution is a little more peaked.





Figure 2: Comparison between our data distribution (blue histogram) and the theoretical distribution (shown by green curve) with the same second-order statistics, for two randomly-selected triplets from each dataset.

## Image Retrieval Task

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of our method for an image retrieval task. Specifically, we compare our method with the standard baseline of random sampling at different training rounds. We show the retrieval results on the CUB-200 dataset, which consists of 200 classes with roughly 30 images in each class. We split the dataset into 40000 training and 33000 test triplets, and performed active learning with a batch size of 600 and an initial pool of 500 triplets. For a given query image, the top four instances from the retrieval set are shown (ranked from most similar to least similar) in Figures 3 and 4.

We also measure the *triplet order accuracy*, defined here as the number of test triplets whose order is preserved by the ranked list of retrieved images. The order accuracy for our method after the 9<sup>th</sup> round of training is  $M_{\text{Ours}}^9 = 95.3\%$ , and after the 12<sup>th</sup> round of training is  $M_{\text{Ours}}^{12} = 96.7\%$ . The corresponding figures for the random baseline are  $M_{\text{Random}}^9 = 90.3\%$  and  $M_{\text{Random}}^{12} = 92\%$ .

Our Method at Training Round=9



Random Sampling at Training Round=9



Our Method at Training Round=12



Random Sampling at Training Round=12




Figure 3: Performance comparison between our method and random sampling for the image retrieval task after two different training rounds. The leftmost column presents a query, and the remaining columns present the first four retrieved images in the order of increasing perceptual distance, left to right. Images with red squares belong to classes different from the query class. Our results indicate that two images from different classes can be visually more similar than two from the same class, highlighting the distinction between perceptual and class-based metrics. The triplet ordering accuracy for  $M_{Ours/Random}^k$  (model trained on triplets selected by our method vs random sampling resp. at  $k^{\text{th}}$  training round):  $M_{\text{Ours}}^0 = 95.3\%$ ,  $M_{\text{Random}}^0 = 90.3\%$ ,  $M_{\text{Ours}}^{12} = 96.7\%$ ,  $M_{\text{Random}}^{12} = 92\%$ .

Our Method at Training Round=9



Random Sampling at Training Round=9



Our Method at Training Round=12



Random Sampling at Training Round=12




Figure 4: Similar results as Figure 3, shown for a different set of query images.