

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Pruning Large Search Spaces using Context Networks

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Computer Science

by

Arjun Satish

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Ramesh Jain, Chair
Professor Nalini Venkatasubramanian
Professor Deva Ramanan
Professor Bill Tomlinson
Dr. Amarnath Gupta

2013

© 2013 Arjun Satish

DEDICATION

(Optional dedication page)
To ...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
CURRICULUM VITAE	ix
ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Importance of Context Discovery	2
1.2 Context in Multimedia	3
1.3 Approach	4
1.4 Examples	5
1.5 Overview	7
2 What is Context?	8
2.1 Previous Definitions	9
2.2 Relation-Centric View of Context	13
2.3 Modeling Context for Real-world Problems	18
2.3.1 Object Types and Semantics	18
2.3.2 Relationships and Constraints	19
2.3.3 Temporal Semantics	20
2.3.4 Spatial Semantics	21
2.3.5 Real-World Knowledge	22
2.3.6 Source Agnosticism	22
2.4 Context for Personal Photos	24
3 Related Work	29
3.1 Ontologies	30
3.2 Data Integration	30
3.3 Computer Vision: Face Recognition/Verification	30

4 Context Discovery Framework	31
4.1 Pruning Search Spaces with CueNet	31
4.2 General Approach	35
4.3 Execution Trace	36
4.3.1 Simple Case	37
4.3.2 Complex Case	39
4.4 Event Model	42
4.5 Data Sources	44
4.6 Conditions for Discovery	47
4.6.1 Context Discovery Algorithm	51
4.7 Implementation	52
5 Analysis and Experiments	53
5.1 Analysis	53
5.2 Experiments	53
5.2.1 Setup	54
5.2.2 Context Discovery	56
5.2.3 Individual List Sizes in a Dataset	58
5.2.4 Search Spaces	59
5.2.5 Conclusion	59
5.3 Known Issues	60
6 Conclusion and Future Work	63
Bibliography	64
A Appendix	69
A.1 Source Mapping	69

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
1.1 Face tagging problems could be challenged by very large search spaces.	2
1.2 The different approaches in search space construction for a multimedia annotation problem.	4
1.3 Who is in this photo?	6
1.4 Mor Naaman at ICMR.	6
1.5 Who is in this photo?	6
1.6 Kasturi and Jain.	6
 2.1 Objects, Events and Entities.	 8
2.2 Information related to the situation of an Object.	10
2.3 Henricksen's observation about temporality of Context.	12
2.4 Modern context aware system obtain data from different sources.	13
2.5 Mor Naaman at ICMR.	14
2.6 Kasturi and Jain.	14
2.7 Utilizing relations to define context for the primary object.	15
2.8 Primary objects.	16
2.9 Associating conference event using the participant-of relation	16
2.10 Associating the keynote event.	16
2.11 Associating the participants using the participant-of relation	16
2.12 Context Network for Mor Naaman's photo.	17
2.13 Intervals and their relations in Allen's Interval Algebra.	21
2.14 Spatial regions which can be represented in the RCC-8 framework.	22
2.15 A Context Network representing real world events, entities and their respective relationships.	24
2.16 Sources containing personal, social and public context for a given photo. . .	27
 4.1 The different approaches in search space construction for a multimedia annotation problem. A traditional classifier setup is shown in (a) where the search space candidates are manually specified. Context is used to generate large static search spaces in (b). The desired framework is shown in (c), which aims to produce small search spaces with many correct annotations.	 32
4.2 Navigation of a discovery algorithm between various data sources.	34
4.3 The Conceptual Architecture of CueNet.	35
4.4 Input Photo.	37
4.5 Available Data Sources.	37

4.6	Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.	37
4.7	Calendar Event.	38
4.8	Context Network after integrating calendar information.	39
4.9	The Conceptual Architecture of CueNet.	40
4.10	Sources which provided relevant context are highlighted by green circles. . .	40
4.11	Input Photo.	41
4.12	Available Data Sources.	41
4.13	Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.	41
4.14	Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.	42
4.15	Context Network after querying conference sources.	43
4.16	Context Network after discovering conference attendees.	43
4.17	Context Network after discovering relations between attendees and owner. .	43
4.18	Context Network after discovering social relations.	44
4.19	Sources used so far.	44
4.20	Context Network after discovering further social relations.	45
4.21	Context Network after tagging all faces.	45
4.22	Sources used to tag all faces.	45
4.23	The various stages in an iteration of algorithm 1.	46
5.1	The distribution of annotations in the ground truth across various sources. .	55
5.2	Grid plots showing the exhaustive search space and pruning in search space for different datasets.	57
5.3	Pruned search space for photos in D0.	58
5.4	Graph showing the contribution of each source type in context discovery. .	60

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
5.1 Profile of datasets used in the experiments.	54
5.2 Sizes of Search Space for each dataset.	56

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CURRICULUM VITAE

Arjun Satish

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science	2012
University name	<i>City, State</i>
Bachelor of Science in Computational Sciences	2007
Another university name	<i>City, State</i>

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Graduate Research Assistant	2007–2013
University of California, Irvine	<i>Irvine, California</i>

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Teaching Assistant	2007–2013
University of California, Irvine	<i>Irvine, California</i>

REFEREED JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS

Ground-breaking article 2012
Journal name

REFEREED CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS

Awesome paper Jun 2011
Conference name

Another awesome paper Aug 2012
Conference name

SOFTWARE

CueNet <https://github.com/wicknicks/cuenet/>
Polyglot implementation of the CueNet ecosystem to tag faces in photos.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Pruning Large Search Spaces using Context Networks

By

Arjun Satish

Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science

University of California, Irvine, 2013

Professor Ramesh Jain, Chair

The search spaces of real world AI problems are extremely large. The strategy adopted to prune large search spaces is to accurately model the environment, and reason which parts of the search space can be pruned without hurting the performance of the decision making algorithm. Although relatively easier in virtual environments, modeling dynamic real world environments is a very challenging problem.

Consider the example of tagging faces in a person's photo album. The search space contains a few billion potential candidates. Any algorithm which attempts to directly tag one of billion people in a given photo will perform poorly. But, given a complete model of the world, the search space needs to be limited only to the entities who were present close to the camera's field of view at the time of photo capture. Now, the algorithm needs to decide over few tens of candidates as opposed to billions.

In this dissertation, we present *Context Networks*, a representation of real world environments used to prune search spaces for real world AI problems, and a novel *Progressive Discovery* algorithm to construct such networks from heterogenous data sources. We facilitate our following discussions through an example system to tag faces in personal photos. We discuss the architecture of a complete system to model data sources, construct context networks for a given AI problem (which in the case of face tagging would be a personal photo and the

exhaustive search space) and provides a pruned version of the search space most relevant to the problem. We also present experiments to quantitatively demonstrate the efficacy of our algorithm.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This dissertation presents a technique to use real world information to tag photos. The primary complexity of photo annotation problems lie in their large search spaces and the diversity of feature-based representations of semantically similar images. Contextual information is used to prune this large search space, following which, the image features are used to select from the *remaining* tags. For example, people with weak social ties do not co-occur often in photos, and by identifying one we can eliminate the other. In this case, we would say that social context is used to prune candidates in a face annotation problem.

Recently, there have been two changes in science and technology communities which motivates us to view real world information as context. First, with mobile phones becoming the primary mode of photo taking, the nature of context has evolved from providing cues about tags, to describing the world around a photo taking moment when a person was clicking the camera. Second, With the ever increasing amount of personal, social and public information, it is becoming harder to specify which subset of these would constitute the most interesting context for a given picture. Thus, it is not clear what data to consider context, and how do we combine them to form models of the real world which will allow photo annotation



Figure 1.1: Face tagging problems could be challenged by very large search spaces.

algorithms to reason what tags to assign various regions in a given photo.

More specifically, we address the problem of constructing computational representations of real world events from various heterogeneous data sources, to reason which parts of the search space can be pruned without hurting the overall performance of the annotation algorithm. We refer to such a representation as the **Context Network** of the photo. The network describes real-world events occurring in the environment, the entities participating in them, and their semantic inter-relationships.

1.1 Importance of Context Discovery

Context plays a vital role in systems developed towards multimedia annotation problems like event/activity recognition in images and video analysis (for example, surveillance videos). A technique to discover relevant context will play a large role in making them more effective, and allow them to operate in large-scale application domains.

Lately, computer science is moving towards social, environmental and economic real-world problems. Social network analysis, data-driven diagnosis in medical sciences, philanthropic engineering, monitoring public interests through real time communication networks, and situation-based advertising are some of the emerging applications in our area. The common requirement for all of them is to construct models of the events occurring in the world, who is participating in them, their attributes and relationships. A technology to construct such a model from various data sources available today will play a key role in the scope and architecture of such systems.

For the purposes of this dissertation, we propose context discovery techniques in the light of photo annotation problems alone, but the technology and ideas are not tightly coupled with any singly media, and can be migrated to assist in solving any problem which requires models of real world information.

1.2 Context in Multimedia

Context has been used to address many multimedia problems [28, 34, 38, 40, 50]. For example, time and location information or social network information from Facebook to address the face recognition problem in personal photos. We refer to such a direct dependency between the search space and a data source as **static linking**. Although these systems are meritorious in their own right, they suffer from the following drawbacks: they are tightly coupled with a few data sources, the unavailability of which would reduce the efficiency of the system, do not employ multiple sources, and therefore the **relations** between them.

Figure 4.1 shows three approaches to building photo annotation systems. Figure 4.1(a) is one of the earliest system setups where the search spaces were manually constructed, and the focus was mainly on constructing smarter features to correctly classify feature sets [51, 6].




Figure 1.2: The different approaches in search space construction for a multimedia annotation problem.

Systems like [50] use a single source like Facebook to populate their search space based on some attributes of the input problem (in this case, the identity of the user). This restricted the search space but it is assumed that all relevant tags will be supplied from the context source, which may turn out to be an expensive restriction (figure 4.1(b)). In contrast, our approach **dynamically links** context sources to the photo.

1.3 Approach

This primary contribution of this dissertation is a ***progressive discovery*** algorithm to ingest information from various real world data sources to construct context networks containing relevant information for pruning the search space for the system. Examples of data sources include social media web services to provide information about events and entities like Facebook, Twitter; services which can be queried to find information about places like Yelp; Sensors on personal mobile phones, for example GPS which inform applications of the

location of a person is present at any given point in time.

In contrast to static linking, progressive discovery **dynamically links** context sources to the photo. It uses all available knowledge about a given problem (the input photo and related properties) to associate a subset of data from various sources as context. This allows us to decouple the technique of gathering context from the properties of the photo data. Because of this decoupling, there is no direct dependency on any specific set of sources, freeing the system developers to plug-and-play with them.

1.4 Examples

Here are two examples of dynamic linking. Figure 1.3 shows a photo of a person about to start his presentation. Progressive discovery is done in three steps. First, the discovery algorithm proceeds to find the EXIF parameters of the photo, and associates the user with the photo. We call such an event where a photo is associated with its spatio-temporal attributes, a **photo-capture-event**. It signifies an event where the user is capturing an image with his camera. Second, these attributes are used to discover *what is other events is the owner part of at this time?* Only those data sources are queried which can provide answers to this, and we obtain a response from a conference database saying that the owner was attending the ICMR conference at Dallas, Texas. Third, given this new conference event, the algorithm discovers what were the conference subevents (like keynotes, talks or break sessions) were occurring at this time. Finally, it finds that Mor Naaman and John Smith were speaker and host for the keynote talk going on that time. Given the two candidates, the face tagging algorithm proceeds to identify the correct tag, figure 1.4.

Now, let's look at the photo in figure 1.5. Context discovery initiates the same way as in the above example, but after searching for events related to the owner in data sources,



Figure 1.3: Who is in this photo?



Figure 1.4: Mor Naaman at ICMR.

finds nothing. It proceeds to rank all known contacts according to location, and given that this photo was taken to the owner’s workplace ranks colleagues higher than friends. The top 20 (an arbitrary constant) ranked candidates are passed to the face tagging algorithm which finds Ramesh Jain in the photo. But not the person to his right in the photo. But now, the `photo-capture-event` has an additional participant, Ramesh, whose calendar can be queried to find events in which he was participating. The calendar returns the entry “Kasturi”. The algorithm uses this term to find all Ramesh’s contacts to find all people with first or last name “Kasturi”, and finds his long time friend and colleague “Rangachar Kasturi”. The face tagging algorithm is invoked with one candidate.



Figure 1.5: Who is in this photo?



Figure 1.6: Kasturi and Jain.

In this first run, the algorithm links only to a conference database, whereas in the second case, it used spatial information, personal calendar and contact information. This variation in linking to sources is the reason for the term dynamic linking. In the later chapters, we

will present techniques to represent and link context in a systematic manner.

1.5 Overview

This dissertation is organized into the following chapters. Chapter 2 provides an overview of context, how context has been used to address problems in various scientific disciplines and how we use context in our specific personal photo tagging application. Chapter 3 describes the related work in computer science, and how this work is informed by them. Chapter 4 describes our context discovery framework, how it models various data sources, and how our progressive discovery algorithm constructs models for real world problems. We facilitate this discussion with an example real world application to tag faces of people in personal photos. Chapter 5 analyzes the algorithmic complexity of different parts of the system, and provides experiments to verify the competence and performance of the system. We also present experiments to confirm the efficacy of our approach in the light of the real world application. Finally, chapter 6 attempts to describe the future possibilities of using context discovery in computer science.

Chapter 2

What is Context?

While trying to define context for the photo application domain, we found the existing definitions lacking one aspect or another. This is due to their object-centric view of context. In contrast, for an application with scope as broad as photo tagging, this chapter draws emphasis to a relation-centric view of context, and differentiate it from previous object centric definitions. Later, these properties of context are used to specify what objects and relationships are most relevant to the tagging problem.




Figure 2.1: Objects, Events and Entities.

Before looking at the different views on context, its advisable to distinguish between ‘objects’ and ‘entities’. We use the word ‘Object’ to collectively refer to events and entities. The term ‘object’ has been used in literature to refer to things which have no temporal properties. But, in our discussion, an ‘object’ could imply an event which exhibits temporal properties.

An entity includes persons, places in the world, for example ‘Starbucks, UC Irvine’, ‘The Eiffel Tower, Paris, France’, or organizations, for example ‘Google Inc’, ‘Royal Society of London’. Effectively, they are objects which do not need temporal descriptors. Events, on the other hand, are objects which rely on temporal attributes.

Our justification for the use of context in a personal face tagging application begins with the assumption: *For a given user, the correctness of face tags for a photograph containing people she has never met is undefined*. This observation prepares us to understand what context is, and how contextual reasoning assists in tagging photos. The description of any problem domain requires a set of abstract data types, and a model of how these types are related to each other. We define contextual types as those which are semantically different from these data types, but can be directly or indirectly related to them via an extended model which encapsulates the original one. Contextual reasoning assists in the following two ways. **First**, contextual data restricts the number of people who might appear in the photographs. We can also argue that all the personal data of a user (her profile on Facebook, LinkedIn, email exchanges, phone call logs) provides a reasonable estimate of all these people who might appear in her photos. **Second**, by reasoning on abstractions in the contextual domain, we can infer conclusions on the original problem. We exploit this property to develop our algorithm in the later sections. Though context based search space pruning can be applied to a variety of recognition problems, we focus on tagging people in personal photos for concreteness, where, the image and person tag form the abstractions in the problem domain, and events and event based relations constitute the contextual domain.

2.1 Previous Definitions

One of the earliest studies on context was done by Bill Schilit et al. in [46]. The focus in this study was how to build software in dynamic environments. The dynamics of the




Figure 2.2: Information related to the situation of an Object.

environments were largely due to people requiring different computational services at the different times, the modality of request (through a mobile device or through a workstation), and the environment of the device (are there cameras and projectors nearby if the task requires video conferencing?). This software-centric view of context highlights the importance of two things. One, context is always described with respect to an object. In this case it is the software which runs on processors distributed in a real world environment. Second, context is used to determine how this object interacts with events and entities near it? For example, Schilit uses the example that a workstation should automatically load his favorite text editor when he approaches it; and an rooster music sample must be played whenever fresh coffee is prepared. Both very different and precise interactions even though they might share common background (environment or participating entities). We would not expect a text editor to be shown when coffee is prepared, and the rooster music to be played when an employee walks to a workstation.

In his seminal paper, Anind Dey [14] describes context *as any information that can be used to characterize the situation of an entity. An entity is a person, place or object that is*

considered relevant to the interaction between a user and an application, including the user and applications themselves, as shown in figure 2.2. He proceeds to explain this definition with the example of an “indoor mobile tour”, arguing that there are two additional pieces of information which can be used: *weather* and *presence of other people*. if the user is present with his friends, they might visit sites that are of interest to everybody. There the presence of other people is important context. Because the tour is indoor, weather does not affect the application. It is true that the weather has no direct affect on the application but what about the following scenarios:

- Could we use the weather information to serve different drinks in the cafeteria to boost the experience of the visitors? On a cold day, placing the hot chocolate kiosk next to the entrance and the ice cream kiosk closer on a warmer day might boost some sales.
- If the tour is similar to Alcatraz, where a ferry ride takes people to the island, and back from it, a storm brewing in the ocean could lead to disrupted ferry services. Should the application warn its users who are leisurely touring at this time? Or should they continue the tour at the same pace, miss the last ferry and spend the night at Alcatraz? After all, accommodation is not a problem.

They then proceed to define Context-Aware computing as follows: *A system is context-aware if it uses context to provide relevant information and/or services to the user, where relevancy depends on the user’s tasks*. But, we need to ask ourselves why a system which uses this “additional information” should be considered a context-aware system? There are numerous systems which would simply consider these “additional information” as regular inputs. What is different between a system which takes in these inputs as processes them as regular data, and one which processes them as context?

Karen Henricksen et al. [27] make the following interesting observation about context: Context information exhibits a range of temporal characteristics. Some context information can




Figure 2.3: Henricksen’s observation about temporality of Context.

be static, for example the attributes of people using a system (for example, the sex of a person). But a large amount of information is dynamic. For example, the current geo position of a person or her social network, as shown in figure 2.3. There is no straightforward way to obtain this dynamic information other than through sensors. But, such a approach tightly couples the application logic to the types of sensors used, and requires the system to convert the input data to usable representations. For example, the application requires explicit modules to convert GPS coordinates to readable addresses. The problem with such an approach is that there are many ad-hoc modules built to tackle the sensors, and therefore causing the context-awareness to be tied to a specific application.

More recently, Vaninha Vieira et al. [52] uses a rule centric view of context to design their context sensitive system, Cemantika. Vaninha defines a contextual element as any piece of data or information which can be used to characterize an entity in an application domain, whereas the context of an interaction between an agent and an application is the set of instantiated contextual elements that are necessary to support the task at hand. Context




Figure 2.4: Modern context aware system obtain data from different sources.

awareness, for them, is to explicitly switch the task the system is executing under different conditions. For this they explicitly model the *context sources* which includes heterogenous and external sources like sensors, user dialog interfaces and databases. Figure 2.4 shows various data sources providing context. Some data sources are preferred over others depending on certain conditions pre-defined in the system. This allows the various processes to operate independently of the type of sources. It should be noted that the use of ontologies is describing knowledge and context sources is becoming increasingly popular (more similar systems are described in chapter 3).

2.2 Relation-Centric View of Context

The common ground behind these definitions is their object centric view of context. Context is largely a set of objects that “surrounds” a primary object (whose context is in question). This view is insufficient while addressing applications which are very broad in scope, the photo tagging application for example, where users can take photos in very diverse environment, and a large number of sensors and sources of context exist. Specifically, it is non-trivial to identify which subset of available data qualifies to be relevant context for the given photo,



Figure 2.5: Mor Naaman at ICMR.



Figure 2.6: Kasturi and Jain.

and which is not. The two examples from chapter 1, are shown in figures 2.5 and 2.6. In order to tag the photo on the left, we exclusively used conference calendar information. Whereas, to tag the photo on the right, we used personal information. Our motivation in this chapter is to extend the above definitions of context to allow context aware systems to better extract relevant context from these various sources.

We define context of a given object at a particular time as “**the real world information which can be related to the object directly or indirectly through a known set of relationships**”. Figure 2.7 is an extension of 2.4 by making explicit the relations between various objects in the application ecosystem. Here, objects contained within two data sources can be related to each other. For example, an object in DS 9 can be related to another in DS 10 with the `related-to` edge. The primary object can be related to an object in DS 2 with an `occurs-at` relationship at time t_1 . Whereas at time t_2 , the relationship with DS 2 does not exist, but a new relationship `occurs-during` surfaces with DS 11.

Relationships can be of different types. They can be simple labels like `friend-of` signifying a social relationship. Or they can be more actionable like `located-at`, which relates a person to a particular location, and therefore causes a particular audio stream to play through the handheld device. This relation is not just a label, it imposes constraints on the properties of objects which it relates. Here, the spatial attributes of the person and the exhibit must



Figure 2.7: Utilizing relations to define context for the primary object.

match if they are being related through a `located-at` attribute. In this dissertation, we will see that such relations, which impose such property constraints are critical in algorithmically determining which information is relevant context. Let us also assume that we have available to us the four types of data sources: event sources, place databases (like yelp.com), weather information sources and social networking information.

Using this relation centric view, we now look at how the examples from chapter 1 can be formulated in a systematic process to discover context. A system to discover context must establish a set of relationships its context objects can be connected with. For the two photos, we choose **participant-of**, which indicates that an entity is a participant in an event, and **subevent-of** which indicates that an event is occurring within another super-event. Thus, any entity can be related to other events through a `participant-of` edge, and events can be related to others events as well as entities through `subevent-of` and the `participant-of` edge respectively.

Figures 2.8 through 2.11 show how the two relationships can be used to gather context for the photo in figure 2.5. Figure 2.8 shows the initial graph created using the `photo-capture-event` and the photographer, `entity:ent81`. Figure 2.9 shows the result of adding context by as-




Figure 2.8: Primary objects.




Figure 2.10: Associating the keynote event.

sociating an event with `entity:ent81`. Given this new graph with three nodes, a context aware system can find more context by trying to find objects which can be related through the two edges. Since one of the nodes is a `conference` event, it proceeds to find events occurring within it, and adds the `keynote event`, which also happens to be the super-event of the `photo-capture-event`. The result is shown in figure 2.10. Finally, the `keynote event` is extended with relations to associate subevents or participants. In this case, the only new context available are the participants of the `keynote event`. These two entities are associated with the event as shown in figure 2.11.

Figure 2.9: Associating conference event using the `participant-of` relation




Figure 2.11: Associating the participants using the `participant-of` relation

In the above example, given a graph containing primary objects, we grew it by relating objects from the real-world using a fixed set of relationships {`participant-of`, `subevent-of`}. Such a graph representing the primary objects, the context objects and their inter-relationships is a **context network**. Figure 2.12 shows one such context network for Mor Naaman's photo taken at ICMR 2013. A similar procedure can be invoked on the photo in figure 2.6 to discover its context network.

Because of the type of relationships chosen, some information which was readily available (weather, place or social networking, for example) was not associated. But if we extend the relationship set to contain another relation `occurs-at`, then the place where the conference was held will be included in the context network. Similarly, the inclusion of a `knows` can relate entities with each other. If the social networking source reports that `entity:ent81` was a friend of Mor Naaman, an additional edge would be introduced between these nodes in the context network. Thus, relations are key in determining which objects are context and which are not, and how they are related to the primary objects.




Figure 2.12: Context Network for Mor Naaman's photo.

It must be noted that asserting a relation-centric view of context is not discounting the importance of objects. Rather, it is a way of saying that relationships are atleast as important as objects are. Keeping this in mind, we will see what are the primitives required to model context for real-world problems in this section.

2.3 Modeling Context for Real-world Problems

There is no silver bullet to model context. Henricksen et al. [27] model context using context graphs, and [43] provides a technique to construct petri nets for given context graphs to implement context-aware behavior. Although, these techniques work for specific domain (for example, [43] presents a domain of class presentations, and [27] presents a case study in context-aware communications), creating context graphs to exist for each and every case which might occur in the real world is non-trivial. Also, with the rapidly changing relations in the real-world, it is not clear what are the good principles and practices to build scalable systems around context graphs.

If we are to represent context networks computationally, we first need to understand what are the basic building blocks of such a network. The following sections list these blocks, and present their properties which are essential in constructing such networks. These blocks are fairly generic, and can be utilized to model context for various application.

2.3.1 Object Types and Semantics

Context is always specified with respect to a real world object. This primary object must be uniquely identifiable in the computational system, and must be an instance of one of the known classes. This object must have some real world attributes. For example, if the object is an event, then the interval during which it occurs, and location of occurrence are two real

world attributes. In the tour guide application, the visitor is one possible primary object whose context needs to be determined. In the photo application, possible types of interest include the `photo-capture-event`, the `photographer`, various possible events which can occur in the world, people and places where photography can occur.

Different objects bring with them very specific semantics. While modeling objects as context, these semantics must be preserved. For example, an event object exists only for a fixed time interval. People can only be present at one place at one point in time. The `photographer` is a person, and therefore inherits the property of being at only one place at a time. In the later chapter, we will see that these semantic properties play a very important role in the context discovery algorithm.

2.3.2 Relationships and Constraints

Context is any event or entity which can be *related* to the objects in a problem. Instead of finding objects which are of a specific type, and qualifying them as context, objects related to the problem variables through specific relationship types are to be considered context. These relationships can impose certain constraints on the objects which they relate. For example, the subevent relation requires that the super-event spatio-temporally contain the smaller event. Such constraints are very common in real-world relationships. An example of a real-world relation can be seen in naturally occurring chemical reactions, where it is not sufficient to have just two reactants at the same time and place, but the reaction could demand very specific environmental factors (like temperature or pressure). The context modeling tool should permit the specification of these specific constraints.

More importantly, the relationships and constraints are not black boxes. Their semantics are transparent to all modules of a discovery engine, and these semantics are being used to reason which objects are part of a context network and which are not. Pushing our example

of chemical reactions, given all the materials and conditions which can be present at a given region, it is almost impossible to treat the relationships between different materials under given conditions to simulate how the various reactions in the region.

In our application of photo tagging, social relations and presence of people in a particular event is to be used to rule them out of other events. Why? Because, a person can be present only at one place at one point in time, and if the events are too far apart or contain a very distribution of people than what a person commonly co-participates with, the chances of that person being present in that photo is very low. Such a relation must be exclusively utilized in the context discovery algorithm.

2.3.3 Temporal Semantics

Modeling context requires the ability to express relationships which assert temporal constraints. For example, during a lunch break at a conference, there are no co-occurring session events; the workshops at a banquet is always the last event at a conference, which could be followed by one or more workshops. Temporal relations have been studied in literature [2, 54], and can be reused for this purpose. Temporal relationships defined in Allen’s Interval Algebra are shown in figure 2.13. Figure shows these relationships. In order to relate events with entities, we use the `occurs-during` relation defined in [23]. For example, the event X is said to `occur-during` the interval I iff X’s temporal extent is equal-to I .

Additional relations `occurs-sometime-during` and `occurs-during-n` are also defined in [23]. An event is said to `occurs-sometime-during` another interval I if its interval is completely within I , but not `equal-to` the extent of I . Look at the `during` relation in figure 2.13. The `occurs-during-n` is used to represent events which occur multiple times within a given interval. This relation is accompanied by an arithmetic function $\phi(n)$ which asserts constraints on the number of occurrences within the interval.




Figure 2.13: Intervals and their relations in Allen’s Interval Algebra.

2.3.4 Spatial Semantics

Real-world events play an important role in context, and therefore, we need to pay special attention to the spatial relationships between entities and events. A large amount of literature is available on spatial representation and reasoning framework originally known as RCC-8. Some of its common relationships are shown in figure 2.14. The important relations in the figure are **disconnected** (B and D), **externally-connected** (B and C), **tangential-proper-part** (A and B), **contained-in** (E and D) and **partial-overlaps** (C and D). In order to represent spatial relations between events and entities, we use the **occurs-at** relation defined in [23]. An event E is said to **occur-at** region S if the spatial extent of E completely lies within S.

Additional relations **occurs-somewhere-at** and **occurs-at-n** are also defined in [23]. An event is said to **occurs-somewhere-at**, if the actual region of occurrence is completely contained the given region, but not fully overlapping with it. The relation **occurs-at-n** is used when the event occurs at multiple places within the given region. This relation is accompanied with a function $\Psi(n)$, which asserts a constraint on the number of occurrences.




Figure 2.14: Spatial regions which can be represented in the RCC-8 framework.

2.3.5 Real-World Knowledge

Modeling real world knowledge is critical in context based systems. This is in contrast with rule based systems, where a set of conditions are evaluated to trigger one or more actions. Examples of knowledge are: An academic conference has atleast one keynote talk; or Sodium reacts with atmospheric oxygen at room temperature; or water expands when it freezes. By explicitly modeling such networks of knowledge, we provide the opportunity to influence extraction of context from different sources. For example, if an object is associated with a keynote talk, data about the co-occurring conference is definitely going to be relevant context. Alternatively, if the system had associated a conference with the object, data about the keynote must be sought out. This ‘guiding light’ trait of knowledge makes it an important prerequisite in a context-aware system.

2.3.6 Source Agnosticism

Most context based techniques rely on sensors or data sources to gather context. Therefore, it must be imperative to separate the sources from how context is obtained. Context must be modeled irrespective of the nature of sources or their query abilities [56]. This provides the following advantage: context is now entirely defined in terms of objects, their possible inter-relationships and real world knowledge decides how objects are related to each other, irrespective of what data actually can be obtained. Second, with the growing number of data

sources, personal and public sensors, this allows system engineers to plug-and-play different sources with ease, without disturbing the model.

This design requirement also brings a problem. How does context-aware system know what data sources are at its disposal, and how does it interact with them? The short answer to this question is to utilize data integration technology [16, 25, 33]. Data integration techniques provide a uniform query interface to a multitude of autonomous data sources, irrespective of their native query capabilities or data storage formats. This might not be most ideal in the long run as these technologies were built to support RDBMS-like analytics operations, and we might benefit by adding more “context operations” into the integration layers, thereby allowing more fruitful grounds for query optimization. But for our current needs, it is advisable to re-use the ideas presented in these techniques to realize a fully working context-based system. The later chapters will describe in detail the data integration framework used to obtain data for the photo application.

There are many tools which partially support encoding models. For example, the ontology specification (OWL 2) supports specification of various objects, their inheritance structure (**is-a**), their inter-relationships (where the inter-relationships can have their own inheritance structure). But encoding time and spatial semantics is a relatively recent capability [29] in such frameworks, and not ready for prime-time for applications like real-world context discovery. Thus, there is no silver bullet for modeling context, and in order to realize full systems, we need to separate the concerning capabilities between existing tools. In our work, relations expressed in OWL are simply labels with domain and range restrictions and sometimes cardinality constraints, their semantics being entirely delegated to the discovery engine.

2.4 Context for Personal Photos

In this section, we list the specific objects, relationships which will be used in constructing context networks, as shown in figure 2.15, for tagging personal photos. Once such a context network is constructed, the search space is derived from it. The types used in the contextual domain, but not limited to, are the following:




Figure 2.15: A Context Network representing real world events, entities and their respective relationships.

- **Event Objects:** events like conferences, parties, trips or weddings, and their structure (for example, what kind of sessions, talks and keynotes are occurring within a particular conference). We also model the photo as media facet of a **photo-capture-event**, which signifies the moment where a person took a photo with his/her camera. We model events as described in [23, 53].
- **Entity Objects:** entities model users, people in their social graph, people with whom

he/she corresponds with using email and other messaging services. The different organizations which can participate in events mentioned above. For example, a company Acme Corp where the user and person X are colleagues working in the same team.

- **Geographical Objects:** Places play an important role. A place can be referenced by a geo position, for example (33.643036, -117.841911), or an address for example “Donald Bren Hall, University of California, Irvine”.

In order to relate the above objects, we use the following types of relationships, along with their constraints and semantics:

- **Subevent Relation:** If two events occur such that one spatio-temporally contains the other, we say that it is the subevent [23] of the one with larger spatio-temporal span. For example, a talk event is a subevent of the conference during which it happens.
- **Participation Relation:** If an entity is participating in an event, s/he is said to be a participant-of that event. Note that this relation constrains the spatio-temporal boundary where the entity could be present during the interval of the event.
- **Social Relation (knows):** Social relations relate people who are acquainted with each other. This is used to model social networking information obtained from sources like Facebook or Email.
- **Spatio-Temporal Relations:** Events occur in specific time intervals, and at some location. We use the relations occurs-at and occurs-during to model these properties. More details are provided in the next chapter.

The above classes of contextual data can be obtained from a variety of data sources. Examples of data sources range from mobile phone call logs and email conversations to Facebook

messages to a listing of public events at [upcoming.com](#). We classify sources into the following types:

- **Metadata:** Photos contain very valuable metadata in the form of EXIF tags. Prior research in multimedia systems has used them extensively to gain remarkable results [7, 49]. We use time and location tags from EXIF in our work to construct `photo-capture-events`. Although we do not use them in our current work, the high importance of sensors embedded inside mobile phones deems their mention. Sensors like gyroscope, inclinometer, accelerometers and ambient light sensors can provide interesting cues about the environment [41, 48].
- **Personal Data:** include all sources which provide details about the particular user whose photo is to be tagged. Some examples of personal data sources include Google Calendar, Email and Facebook profile and social graph. Details include common personal attributes like name, date-of-birth, place of residence, place of work, the various they are attending (personal calendar), their personal preferences (type of food, music concerts, activity preferences).
- **Social Data:** include all sources which provide contextual information about a user's friends and colleagues. For example, LinkedIn, Facebook and DBLP are some of the commonly used websites with different types of social graphs. The information includes the personal information of the user's friends, their past or future activities where their participate together, their common friends (communities in social networks [4, 31]),
- **Public Data:** include all sources which provide information about public organizations (for example restaurants, points of interest or football stadiums) or about public events (for example conferences, fairs, concerts or sports games). Some sources include Yelp, Upcoming, DBLP and SimpleGeo.




Figure 2.16: Sources containing personal, social and public context for a given photo.

Figure 2.16 shows some commonly available personal, social and public sources. Social and public data sources are enormous in size, containing information about billions of events and entities. Trying to use them directly will lead to scalability problems similar to those faced by face recognition and verification techniques. But, by using personal data, we can identify which parts of social and public sources are more relevant. For example, if a photo was taken at San Francisco, CA (where the user lives), his family in China is less relevant. Thus, the role of personal information is twofold. **Firstly**, it provides contextual information regarding the photo. **Secondly**, it acts as a bridge to connect to social and public data sources to discover interesting people connected to the user who might be present in the event and

therefore, the photo.

At this point we should revisit the **temporal relevance** property of a data source. Given a stream of photos taken during a time interval, the source which contributed interesting context for a photo might not be equally useful for the one appearing next. This is because sources tend to focus on a specific set of event types or relationship types, and the two photos might be captured in different events or contains persons with whom the user maintains relations through different sources. For example, two photos taken at a conference might contain a user's friends in the first, but with advisers of these friends in the next. The friends might interact with the user through a social network, but their advisers might not. By using a source like DBLP, the relations between the adviser and friends can be discovered. We say that the temporal relevance of these context sources is *low*. This requirement will play an important role in the design of our framework, as now, sources are not hardwired to photo, but instead need to be discovered gradually.

In short, the problem to be tackled is to construct context networks similar to the one shown in figure 2.15 using metadata, personal, social and public sources as shown in figure 2.16. This problem will be addressed using our context discovery algorithm, presented in chapter 4. The next chapter, will present a short survey of various techniques relevant to our problem, and highlight the important ideas which helped develop the algorithms presented in this dissertation.

Chapter 3

Related Work

The role of context in computing has been studied in [11]. The use of context in image retrieval is emphasized in [30, 13]. Barthelmess et al. extract semantic tags from noisy datasets containing discussions, speeches about a set of photos in question[5]. Naaman et al. have exploited GPS attributes to extract place and person information [37, 38]. Rattenbury [42] devised techniques to find tags which describe events or places by analyzing their spatiotemporal usage patterns. Ames and Frohlich [3, 20] independently describe a survey conducted to study motivations for people to tag their photos. They noticed two broad motivations: Organization of photos and Communication with photos. Time alone is used for organizing photos in [22, 24]. Brave new world applications for photography have been described in [21, 17], where life logs were collected in the form of photos, emails, document scans and stored in SQL Server database, and photos were retrieved using SQL queries. The photo content was tagged by the user in this case. The Computer Vision community has contributed extensive work in the area of detecting scenes [55], humans [12] or geo localization [26]. Context information and image features are used in conjunction by [40, 9, 8, 10] identify tags. The semantic web community is using linked data technologies to annotate and query photographs [35, 39]. Collaborative games also have been evaluated as a possible

way to tag photos[15]. Systems like Picasa, iPhoto and [22] organize photos based on time, GPS coordinates and sometimes faces in the photo. These attributes of the photo do not capture event semantics [45]. Events are a natural way of categorizing photo media. Events also allow large number of photos captured during a single event be organized hierarchically using subevents.

The core of their view comes from the earlier proposed definition from Brezillon [CITE], who considers context to be formed from three types of knowledge: Contextual knowledge (knowledge about entities, their environments), external knowledge (knowledge which is currently not relevant), and proceduralized context, which has to do with the reasoning applied to the current situation.

150 definitions of context by Brezillon. [36] provides a survey of some known graph modeling techniques.

3.1 Ontologies

Lack of facilities to express spatio-temporal constraints.

3.2 Data Integration

3.3 Computer Vision: Face Recognition/Verification

Chapter 4

Context Discovery Framework

In this chapter, we shall look at the the CueNet framework and its components: a *data integration module* to model and query the various data sources and sensors, a *discovery algorithm* to construct queries agnostic to what to the sources themselves, a *knowledge representation module* to store relationships about the various real world objects, and finally how these parts integrate with a *face verification algorithm*, which predicts if a person is present in a photo or not.

4.1 Pruning Search Spaces with CueNet

Automatic media annotation algorithms essentially assign one or more labels from a search space to a given input image. Figure 4.1 shows the various approaches of constructing such a search space for such an algorithm. The traditional approach is shown in 4.1(a). These spaces were limited to a set of labels chosen by an expert, with no way of pruning the search space in case it got very large. The focus was instead on extracting the best features from images, to obtain high overall classification accuracy[51].




Figure 4.1: The different approaches in search space construction for a multimedia annotation problem. A traditional classifier setup is shown in (a) where the search space candidates are manually specified. Context is used to generate large static search spaces in (b). The desired framework is shown in (c), which aims to produce small search spaces with many correct annotations.

With the popularity of global social networks and proliferation of mobile phones, information about people, their social connections and day-to-day activities are becoming available at a very large scale. The web provides an open platform for documenting many real world events like conferences, weather events and sports games. With such context sources, the search space construction is being delegated to one or a few sources [28, 34, 38, 40, 50] (figure 4.1(b)). These approaches rely on a single *type* of context. For example, time and location information or social network information from Facebook to solve the face recognition problem. We refer to such a direct dependency between the search space and a data source as **static linking**. Although these systems are meritorious in their own right, they suffer from the following drawbacks: they do not employ multiple sources, and therefore the **relations** between them. By realizing that these sources are interconnected in their own way, we are able to treat the entire source topology as a network. Our intuition in this work is to navigate this network

to progressively discover the search space for a given media annotation problem. Figure 4.1(c) shows how context discovery can provide substantially smaller search spaces for a set of images, which contain a large number of correct tags. A small search space with large number of true positives provides the ideal ground for a classification algorithm to exhibit superior performance.

The CueNet framework, provides access to multiple data sources containing event, social, and geographical information through a unified query interface to extract information from them. CueNet encapsulates our **Context Discovery Algorithm**, which utilizes the query interface to discover the most relevant search space for a media annotation problem. To ensure a hands-on discussion, we show the use of context discovery in a real world application: face tagging in personal photos. As a case study, we will attempt to tag photos taken at conference events by different users. These photos could contain friends, colleagues, speakers giving very interesting talks, or newly found acquaintances (who are not yet connected to the user through any social network). This makes the conference photos particularly interesting because no single source can provide all the necessary information. It emphasizes the need to utilize multiple sources in a meaningful way.

Here is an **example** to illustrate CueNet’s discovery process. Let’s suppose that Joe takes a photo with a camera that records time and GPS in the photo’s EXIF header. Additionally, Joe has two friends. One with whom he interacts on Google+, and the other using Facebook. The framework checks if either of them have any interesting event information pertaining to this time and location. We find that the friend on Google+ left a calendar entry describing an event (a title, time interval and name of the place). The entry also marks Joe as a participant. In order to determine the category of the place, the framework uses Yelp.com with the name and GPS location to find whether it is a restaurant, sports stadium or an apartment complex. If the location of the event was a sports stadium, it navigates to upcoming.com to check what event was occurring here at this time. If a football game or a music concert was taking




Figure 4.2: Navigation of a discovery algorithm between various data sources.

place at the stadium, we look at Facebook to see if the friend “Likes” the sports team or music band. By traversing the different data sources in this fashion, the number of people, who could potentially appear in Joe’s photograph, was incrementally built up, rather than simply reverting to everyone on his social network or people who could be in the area where the photograph was taken. We refer to such navigation between different data sources to identify relevant contextual information as **progressive discovery**. The salient feature of CueNet is to be able to progressively discover events, and their associated properties, from the different data sources and relate them to the photo capture event. We argue that given this structure and relations between the various events, CueNet can make assertions about the presence of a person in the photograph. Once candidates have been identified by CueNet, they are passed to the face tagging algorithm (as in [32]), which can perform very well as their search space is limited to two candidates.

Figure 4.3 shows the different components of the CueNet framework. The **Ontological Event**




Figure 4.3: The Conceptual Architecture of CueNet.

Models specify various event and entity classes, and the different relations between them. These declared types are used to define the **Data Sources** which provides access to different types of contextual data. The **Person Verification Tools** consist of a database of people, their profile information and photos containing these people. When this module is presented with a candidate and the input photograph, it compares the features extracted from the candidate's photos and the input photo to find the confidence threshold. In this section, we describe each module, and how the context discovery algorithm utilizes them to accomplish its task.

4.2 General Approach

Figure 4.3 shows a high level architecture of CueNet. The major functional blocks consist of a data integration system (left), which provides a uniform query interface to a multitude of autonomous data sources, which may reside within an enterprise or on the World-Wide

Web [25]; a specification of model describing real-world knowledge in terms of objects and their relations, along with any axioms and constraints to be imposed on instance graphs (top); since we are assisting face tagging application, the final block (right) consists of a set of hooks to invoke appropriate face tagging algorithms by providing a set of candidate for the input photo. In this work, we shall assume verification semantics in such a tagging algorithm, where given an input photo and a candidate person, the algorithm returns true or false (with a confidence score). Face recognition models would have to be retrained when the candidate set changes. Also, as described in chapter 3, the state-of-the-art techniques for face verification perform much more reliably than their recognition counterparts. At the heart of CueNet, lies the context discovery algorithm. Given a photo the algorithm constructs a context network with all the known information. Using the knowlege base, the algorithm constructs queries to be executed on the interface provided by the data integration layer. Objects which are returned are merged into existing context network. New entities in the network are passed to the face tagging algorithm to check for their presence in the photo. If they are present, the context network is altered to reflect this fact. The execute-merge cycle is iteratively performed until all the faces are tagged, or the data integration module is unable to furnish any new data.

4.3 Execution Trace

In this section, we will trace the execution on two different photos, to see how the different modules interact to produce context networks, and how they are used to tag faces. The first example will be a relatively simpler one, requiring only 2 data sources, whereas the second photo will require multiple sources to sucessfully tag all photos.

4.3.1 Simple Case

Consider the photo shown in figure 4.4. For the purposes of this trace, we assume that we have access to the sources shown in figure 4.5 through the data integration module. Given, an input photo, the knowledge base is queried to find what other objects can be associated with an photo object. The KB stores the information that every photo consists of an EXIF header, which stores timestamp and location coordinates and a fact which states that every photo is owned by a user object, where **owner-of** is a relationship described in the KB. This knowledge is used to construct the context network shown in figure 4.6.



Figure 4.4: Input Photo.



Figure 4.5: Available Data Sources.



Figure 4.6: Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.

Now, the algorithm traverses the graph to list all the possible queries it can execute on the data integration layer. Given the knowledge that entities participate in events, and events

can contain participants, it generates the following queries:

- Does any data source contain participant information related to the photo capture event?
- What events is the owner (entity:ArjunSatish) participating at time, t and location, l?

The data integration system looks at the different sources and says that none of them store information about photo capture events, and skips executing the first query. But many sources describe events, and store their participants too (Google Calendar, Facebook, Conference Calendar). These query is converted to their native formats (API calls or relational database queries) and results, are sent back to the data integration module. We see that there was a calendar entry returned by the Google Calendar source, as shown in 4.7. This information is now merged with the existing context graph to produce a context graph similar to that shown in 4.8.




Figure 4.7: Calendar Event.

Now, we have new entities related to the photo. The face verification algorithm is invoked with the new set of candidates. It must be noted that this verification problem is much easier than trying to verify out of many thousands of candidates. Once the correct entity is identified, the photo is annotated as shown in figure 4.9.




Figure 4.8: Context Network after integrating calendar information.

One last look at the source diagram in figure 4.10 shows which data sources revealed interesting information related to this photo. In this case, EXIF provided some relevant context on when and where the photo was taken. The owner's personal calendar provided information on what event was occurring during the time of photo capture, and who else was involved in it.

4.3.2 Complex Case

Now, we will consider a more complex case which requires more than just metadata and personal sources for successful tagging. The photo under consideration is shown in 4.11. We will use the same set of data sources, shown again in 4.12.

Using metadata sources and personal information, we arrive at the context network shown in figure 4.13. The procedure until here is exactly same as that for the previous scenario. Now, given the known state of the world, if we invoke the face verification tools, we discover that the owner is actually present in the photo (figure 4.14). In this case, the candidate set contains just one entity, and therefore reduces the complexity of the tagging algorithm.




Figure 4.9: The Conceptual Architecture of CueNet.



Figure 4.10: Sources which provided relevant context are highlighted by green circles.

The next query generated by the system is to discover what the (entity:ArjunSatish) was doing at this time? But, this time we find that the conference calendar holds the answer.

At this point, the conference event is known to our knowledge base to have a definite structure, in terms of keynote, session and talk events with lunch/coffee breaks interleaved, and having many attendees. So it immediately queries the conference source to find and merge all of these objects. It discovers that the photo was taken during a break event, and that the conference (VLDB 2009) has many hundreds of participants, as shown in figure 4.16.

Figure 4.16 shows the various attendees discovered by the algorithm from the conference source. But finding 3 candidates from hundreds is an equally challenging task. Before invoking the face tagging algorithm, we want to see if we can discover any more relations between the objects in the context network. So the discovery algorithm consults the knowledge base to find that entities can be related through a **friend-of** relation. So it queries all known



Figure 4.11: Input Photo.



Figure 4.12: Available Data Sources.




Figure 4.13: Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.

sources to find friend relations, and finds that Facebook, Gmail and Twitter are sources which store data containing this relation. Querying it reveals that a few of the entities who were present at the conference were related to the user, and therefore have a bigger chance of appearing in the photo. The face verifier is invoked only with these candidates, for potential true positives. By doing this we tag two more faces in the photo. The context network is shown in the figure 4.18.

Since we have more candidates tagged in the photo, we can repeat the above procedure to discover more relation between the entites related to the photo and those who are present in the conference. This time results are returned from Gmail, and none from Facebook and Twitter (because these people had sent emails to each other during the conference, but did not connect through Facebook or Twitter). The changes in the context network are shown in 4.20 and 4.21. Figure 4.22 highlights all sources which returned relevant context for this



Figure 4.14: Context Network built after User Information and EXIF sources are queried and merged.



trace.

4.4 Event Model

Our ontologies extend the E* model[23] to specify relationships between events and entities. Specifically, we utilize the relationships “**subevent-of**”, which specifies event containment. An event e_1 is a subevent-of of another event e_2 , if e_1 occurs completely within the spatiotemporal bounds of e_2 . Additionally, we utilize the relations **occurs-during** and **occurs-at**, which specify the space and time properties of an event. Also, another important relation



Figure 4.15: Context Network after querying conference sources.




Figure 4.16: Context Network after discovering conference attendees.




Figure 4.17: Context Network after discovering relations between attendees and owner.

between entities and events is the “**participant**” property, which allows us to describe which entity is participating in which event. It must be noted that participants of a subevent are also participants of the parent event. A participation relationship between an event and person instance asserts the presence of the person within the spatiotemporal region of the event. We argue that the reverse is also true, i.e., if a participant P is present in \mathcal{L}_P during the time \mathcal{T}_P and an event E occurs within the spatiotemporal region $\langle \mathcal{L}_E, \mathcal{T}_E \rangle$, we say P is a participant of E if the event’s spatiotemporal span contained that of the participant.

$$\text{participant}(E, P) \iff (\mathcal{L}_P \sqsubset_L \mathcal{L}_E) \wedge (\mathcal{T}_P \sqsubset_T \mathcal{T}_E) \quad (4.1)$$

The symbols \sqsubset_L and \sqsubset_T indicate spatial and temporal containment respectively. Please refer to [23] for more details. In later sections, we refer to the location and time of the event, \mathcal{L}_E and \mathcal{T}_E as $E.\text{occurs-at}$ and $E.\text{occurs-during}$ respectively.




Figure 4.18: Context Network after discovering social relations.



Figure 4.19: Sources used so far.

4.5 Data Sources

The ontology makes available a vocabulary of classes and properties. Using this vocabulary, we can now declaratively specify the schema of each source. With these schema descriptions, CueNet can infer what data source can provide what type of data instances. For example, the framework can distinguish between a source which describes conferences and another which is a social network. We use a LISP like syntax to allow developers of the system to specify these declarations. The example below describes a source containing conference information.

```
(:source conferences
  (:attrs url name time location title))
```




Figure 4.20: Context Network after discovering further social relations.




Figure 4.21: Context Network after tagging all faces.



Figure 4.22: Sources used to tag all faces.

```
(:rel conf type-of conference)
(:rel time type-of time-interval)
(:rel loc type-of location)
(:rel attendee type-of person)
(:rel attendee participant-in conf)
(:rel conf occurs-at loc)
(:rel conf occurs-during time)
(:axioms
  (:map time time)
  (:map loc location)
  (:map conf.title ltitle)
  (:map conf.url url)
  (:map attendee.name name)))
```




Figure 4.23: The various stages in an iteration of algorithm 1.

A source declaration comprises of a single nested s-expression. We will refer to the first symbol in each expression as a keyword, and the following symbols as operands. This above declaration uses five keywords (**source**, **attrs**, **rel**, **axioms**, **map**). The **source** keyword is the root operator, and declares a unique name of the data source. The source mapper can be queried for finding accessors using this name. The **attrs** keyword is used to list the attributes of this source. Currently we assume a tuple based representation, and each operand in the attrs expression maps to an element in the tuple. The **rel** keyword allows construction of a relationship graph where the nodes are instances of ontology concepts. And edges are the relationships described by this particular source. In the above example, we construct individuals *conf*, *time*, *loc* and *attendee* who are instances of the *conference*, **time-interval**, **location** and **person** class respectively. We further say that attendee is a **participant of** the conference, which **occurs-at** location loc and **occurs-during** the interval time. Finally, the mapping **axioms** are used to map nodes in the relationship graph to attributes of the data source. For example, the first axiom (specified using the map keyword) maps the time node to the time attribute. The third map expression creates a literal called title, and associates it to the conference node, whose value comes from the ltitle attribute of the conference data source.

Formally, we represent the given ontology as O . The various classes and properties in O are represented by C^O and P^O respectively. Since our upper ontology consists of DOLCE

and E^* , we assume the inclusion of the classes `Endurant`, `Perdurant`, `Event` and `Person` in C^O . Each source S consists of three parts, a relation graph $G^S(V^S, E^S)$ where the nodes $V^S \in C^O$, specify the various “things” described by the source. The edges $E^S \in P^O$ specify the relations among the nodes. Any graph retrieved from such a source is an instance of the relation graph, G^S . Further, the tuple A_T^S consists of the attributes of the data source. Finally, the mapping $M^S : \{G^S \rightarrow A_T^S\}$ specifies how to map different nodes in the relation graph to the different attributes of the native data source.

4.6 Conditions for Discovery

CueNet is entirely based on reasoning in the event and entity (i.e., person) domain, and the relationships between them. These relationships include participation (event-entity relation), social relations (entity-entity relation) and subevent relation (event-event). For the sake of simplicity, we restrict our discussions to events whose spatiotemporal spans either completely overlap or do not intersect at all. We do not consider events which partially overlap. In order to develop the necessary conditions for context discovery, we consider the following two axioms:

Entity Existence Axiom: Entities can be present in one place at a time only. The entity cannot exist outside a spatiotemporal boundary containing it.

Participation Semantics Axiom: If an entity is participating in two events at the same time, then one is the subevent of the other.

Given, the ontology O , we can construct event instance graph $G^I(V^I, E^I)$, whose nodes are instances of classes in C^O and edges are instances of the properties in P^O . The context discovery algorithm relies on the notion that given an instance graph, *queries* to the different sources can be automatically constructed. A query is a set of predicates, with one or more

unknown variables. For the instance graph $G^I(V^I, E^I)$, we construct a query $Q(D, U)$ where D is a set of predicates, and U is a set of unknown variables.

Query Construction Condition: Given an instance graph $G^I(V^I, E^I)$ and ontology $O(C^O, P^O)$, a query $Q(D, U)$ can be constructed, such that D is a set of predicates which represent a subset of relationships specified in G^I . In other words, D is a subgraph induced by G^I . U is a class, which has a relationship $r \in P^O$, with a node $n \in D$. Essentially, the ontology must prescribe a relation between some node n through the relationship r . In our case, the relation r will be either a **participant** or **subevent** relation. If the relationship with the instances does not violate any object property assertions specified in the ontology, we can create the query $Q(D, U)$.

Identity Condition: Given an instance graph $G^I(V^I, E^I)$, and a result graph $G^R(V^R, E^R)$ obtained from querying a source, we can merge two events only if they are identical. Two nodes $v_i^I \in V^I$ and $v_r^R \in V^R$ are identical if they meet the following two conditions **(i)** Both v_i^I and v_r^R are of the same class type, and **(ii)** Both v_i^I and v_r^R have exactly overlapping spatiotemporal spans, indicated by the $=_L$ and $=_T$. Mathematically, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^I = v_r^R \iff & (v_i^I.\text{type-of} = v_r^R.\text{type-of}) \wedge \\ & (v_i^I.\text{occurs-at} =_L v_r^R.\text{occurs-at}) \wedge \\ & (v_i^I.\text{occurs-during} =_T v_r^R.\text{occurs-during}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Subevent Condition: Given an instance graph $G^I(V^I, E^I)$, and a result graph $G^R(V^R, E^R)$ obtained from querying a source, we can construct a subevent edge between two nodes $v_i^I \in V^I$ and $v_r^R \in V^R$, if one is spatiotemporally contained within the other, and has at least one common **Endurant**.

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^I \sqsubset_L v_r^R, \\ v_i^I \sqsubset_T v_r^R \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

$$v_i^I.\mathbf{Endurants} \cap v_r^R.\mathbf{Endurants} \neq \{\phi\} \quad (4.4)$$

Here $v_i^I.\mathbf{Endurants}$ is defined as a set $\{w | w \in V_i^I \wedge w.\text{type-of} = \text{Endurant}\}$. If equation (4.4) does not hold, we say that v_i^I and v_r^R co-occur.

Merging Event Graphs: Given the above conditions, we can now describe an important building block for the context discovery algorithm: the steps needed to merge two event graphs. An example for this is shown in figure 4.23(b-d). Given the event graph consisting of the photo capture event on the left of (b) and a meeting event m and conference event c , containing their respective participants. In this example, the meeting event graph, m is semantically equivalent to the original graph. But the conference event, c is telling that the person AG is also participating in a conference at the time the photo was taken. The result of merging is shown in (d). An event graph merge consists of two steps. The first is a **subevent hierarchy join**, and the second is a **prune-up step**.

Given an original graph, O_m , and a new graph N_m , the join function works as follows: All nodes in N_m are checked against all nodes in O_m to find identical counterparts. For entities, the identity is verified through an identifier, and for events, equation (4.2) is used. Because of the entity existence and participation semantics axioms, all events which contain a common participant are connected to their respective super event using the subevent relation (equations (4.3) and (4.4) must be satisfied by the events). Also, if two events have no common participant, then they can be still be related with the subevent edge, if the event model says it is possible. For example, if in a conference event model, keynotes, lunches and banquets are declared as known subevents of an event. Then every keynote event, or banquet event to be merged into an event graph is made a subevent of the conference event, if the equation (4.3) holds between the respective events.

It must be noted that node AG occurs twice in graph (c). In order to correct this, we use the participation semantics axiom. We traverse the final event graph from the leaves to the root events, and remove every person node if it appears in a subevent. This is the **prune-up** step. Using these formalisms, we now look at the working of the context discovery algorithm.

Algorithm 1: The Context Discovery Algorithm

Data: A photograph H , with a set of detected faces F . Voting threshold, T . The owner O of the photo.

Result: For each face $f \in F$, a set of atmost k person tags.

```

1 begin
2
3     function discover(): {
4         while (DQ is not empty): {
5             node = DQ.dequeue()
6             results = query (node)
7             E ← merge (E, results)
8             if (termination_check()):
9                 return prepare_results();
10            }
11            reconstruct DQ ← E
12            discover()
13        }
14
15    function merge(O, N): {
16        remove_duplicates()
17        M ← subevent_hierarchy_join(O, N)
18        prune_up(M)
19        if (less than T new candidates were discovered):
20            push_down(M)
21        else:
22            vote_and_verify(M)
23        return M;
24    }
25
26    E ← construct event graph with H and O
27    construct discoverable nodes queue, DQ ← E
28    return discover()
29 end

```

4.6.1 Context Discovery Algorithm

Algorithm 1 below outlines the tail recursive discovery algorithm. The input to the algorithm is a photo (with EXIF tags) and an associated owner (the user). It must be noted that by seeding the graph with owner information, we bias the discovery towards his/her personal information. An event instance graph is created where each photo is modeled as a photo capture event. Each event and entity is a node in the instance graph. Each event is associated with time and space attributes. All relationships are edges in this graph. All EXIF tags are literals, related to the photo with data property edges. Figure 4.23 graphically shows the main stages in a single iteration of the algorithm.

The event graph is traversed to produce a queue of entity and event nodes, which we shall refer to as DQ (discovery queue). The algorithm consists of two primary functions: **discover** and **merge**. The discover function is tail recursive, invoking itself until a termination condition is reached (when at most k tags are obtained for all faces or no new data is obtained from all data sources for all generated queries). The behavior of the query function depends on the type of the node. If the node is an event instance, the function consults the ontology to find any known sub-events, and queries data sources to find all these subevents, its properties and participants of the input event node. On the other hand, if it is an entity instance, the function issues a query to find all the events it is participating in.

Results from data source wrappers are returned in the form of event graphs. These event graphs are merged into the original event graph by taking the following steps. First, it identifies **duplicate** events using the conditions mentioned above. Second, it identifies subevent hierarchies using the graph merge conditions described above, and performs a **subevent hierarchy join**. Third, the function **prune-up** removes entities from an event when its subevent also lists it as a participant node. Fourth, **push-down** is the face verification step if the number of entities in the parents of the photo-capture events is small (less than T).

Push down will try to verify if any of the newly discovered entities are present in the photo and if they are (if the tagging confidence is higher than the given threshold), the entities are removed from the super event, and linked to the photo capture event as its participant. On the other hand, if this number is larger than T , the algorithm initiates the **vote-and-verify** method, which ranks all the candidates based on social relationships with people already identified in the photo. For example, if a candidate is related to two persons present in the photo through some social networks, then its score is 2. Ranking is done by simply sorting the candidate list by descending order of score. The face verification runs only on the top ranked T candidates. If there are still untagged faces after the termination of the algorithm, we vote over all the remaining people, and return the ranked list for each untagged face.

Figure 4.23 shows the various stages in the algorithm graphically. (a) shows an example event graph describing a photo taken at a meeting. The meeting consists of three participants AG, SR and AS. The photo contains SR and AS. (b) shows two events returned from the data sources. One is a meeting event which is semantically identical to the input. The other is a conference event with AG. (c) shows the result of merging these graphs. (d) The `prune-up` function removes the duplicate reference to AG.
A live visualization of these steps for different photos can be found at <http://cuenet.site44.com>.

4.7 Implementation

Chapter 5

Analysis and Experiments

5.1 Analysis

5.2 Experiments

In this section, we analyze how CueNet drives a real world face tagging application. The application contains a set of photos, and a database of people, and its goal is to associate the right persons for each photo, with high accuracy. The goal of CueNet, and the focus of our analysis, is to provide small search spaces so that the application can exhibit high accuracy in all datasets.

In the following evaluation, we investigate three hypotheses. **First**, what sources provide the most interesting context? **Second**, how small are the candidates lists constructed by the discovery algorithm, which are provided to the classification algorithm as a “pruned” version of the search space? And **third**, what percentage of true positives does this pruned search space contain?

5.2.1 Setup

We use 368 photos taken at 7 different conferences in our face tagging experiment. The person database consists of 660 people. Each photo contains one or more persons from this database. The owner of the photos was asked to provide access to their professional Google Calendar to access personal events. Information from social networks was gathered. Specifically, events, social graph, photos of user and their friends from Facebook. In order to obtain information of the conference event, we used the Stanford NER[19] to extract names of people from the conference web pages. Descriptions of the keynote, session and banquet events were manually entered into the database. Our sources also included personal emails, access to public events website [upcoming.com](#) (Yahoo! Upcoming) and used Yahoo! PlaceFinder for geocoding addresses.

The ground truth was annotated by the user with our annotation interface. For each photo, this essentially consisted of the ID of the persons in it. We will denote each dataset as ‘Di’ (where $1 \leq i \leq 8$ for each dataset). Table 5.1 describes each dataset in terms of number of photos, unique annotations in ground truth and the year they were captured. The total number of unique people who could have appeared in any photo in our experiments is 660. This set forms the exhaustive search space, L from section ??.

Dataset	Unique People	No. of Photos	Year
D1	43	78	2012
D2	24	108	2012
D3	6	16	2010
D4	7	10	2010
D5	36	80	2009
D6	18	65	2013
D7	7	11	2013

Table 5.1: Profile of datasets used in the experiments.

We divide the sources into different categories to facilitate a more general discussion. The




Figure 5.1: The distribution of annotations in the ground truth across various sources.

categories are “Personal Information” (same as Owner Information in section 4.6.1), “Event sources”, and “Social Networks”. Event sources include Facebook events, Yahoo Upcoming web service, our conference events database among other sources. Social networks include Facebook’s social graph. Personal information contained information about the user, and a link to their personal calendars. An annotation is considered “Out of Context Network” if it is not in any of these sources.

Figure 5.1 shows the distribution of the ground truth annotations across various sources, for each dataset. For example, the bar corresponding to D2 says that 87.5% of ground truth annotations were found in event sources, 41.67% in social networks, 4.17% in personal information and 12.5% were not found in any source, and therefore marked as “Out of Context Network”. From this graph it is clear that event sources contain a large portion of ground truth annotations. Besides D4, a minimum of 70% of our annotations are found in event sources for all datasets, and for some datasets (D3, D7) all annotations are found in event sources. The sum total of contributions will add up to values more than 100% because they share some annotations among each other. For example, a friend on Facebook might

show up at a conference to give the keynote talk.

5.2.2 Context Discovery

Now, lets look at reduction obtained in state space with the discovery algorithm. The total number of people in our experiment universe is 660. By statically linking the sources, we would expect the search space to contain 660 candidates for tagging any of the datasets. However, the context discovery algorithm reduced the size of the search space as shown in table 5.2. The search space varies from 7 people in D7 (1%) to 338 people in D2 (51%). We denote the term hit rate as the percentage of true positives in the search space. Even if our search space is small, it might contain no annotations from the ground truth, leading to poor classifier performance. The hit rates are also summarized in table 5.2. For D4, the algorithm found no event sources (as seen in figure 5.1), and therefore constructed a search space which was too small, thereby containing none of the ground truth. With the exception for D4, the hit rate is always above 83%. We observe an overall reduction in the search space size, with a high hit rate for majority of the datasets.

Dataset	Reduced Search Space Size	Hit Rate
D1	42	83.72%
D2	338	87.5%
D3	231	100%
D4	1	0%
D5	254	83.33%
D6	20	88.89%
D7	7	100%

Table 5.2: Sizes of Search Space for each dataset.

We now investigate the role of different context sources in the discovery algorithm. If an entity in the search space was merged into the event graph by an event source, they are




Figure 5.2: Grid plots showing the exhaustive search space and pruning in search space for different datasets.

said to be “contributed” from it. We profiled our algorithm to log all contributions which were true positives for the classification algorithm. Figure 5.4 shows the contribution from various sources for all datasets. For example, D1 obtained 69.77% of true positives in its search space from event sources, 2.33% from personal information and 11.63% from social networks. 16.28% of true positives for D1 were obtained from no source, and were therefore marked as “Out of Context Network”.

This graph brings to light our argument that most of the true positives, for all datasets, were obtained as a result of navigating the event sources. It will also be noted that the role of social networks is minimal. It was found useful for only one dataset. Relying on social networking sources would have led to a large number of false positives in the classifier performance. Even though the role of personal information is negligible, it is critical in linking in photos to the owner, and from there to different events. Without the availability of personal information, the algorithm would not have reached the context rich event sources.




Figure 5.3: Pruned search space for photos in D0.

5.2.3 Individual List Sizes in a Dataset

Here we look at how CueNet reduces the number of possible candidates for all photos in a dataset. For this setup, the complete candidate set L , contained 1894 labels (total number of people present at the conference, user's emails and social graph). The figure 5.3 shows various statistics for each photo, which includes the maximum size of the list which was generated by the discovery algorithm, the actual number of people in the photos, the number of true positives and false positives. As it can be seen, the size of the discovered set S , never exceeded 12. This is 0.5% of the original candidate list. Because the total number of possible participants (list size) was low, our False Positive rate (FP) was very low too. Most of the false positives were due to profile orientation of faces or obstructions (this was because the face detector was smart enough to pick up profile faces, but verification worked better only on frontal faces).

5.2.4 Search Spaces

Finally, we compare the various search spaces constructed by discovery algorithm. We represent all people in our experiment universe in a color grid (with 33x20 cells for 660 people). Each cell represents the presence or absence of a person in the search space. If a person was present in the candidate list provided to the tagging algorithm, we color the corresponding cell green, otherwise it is colored white. Figure 5.2 shows the color grids describing search spaces for all datasets, and an exhaustive search space. The positioning of people along the grid is arbitrary, but consistent across grids. Our aim in this visualization is to see the diversity in search spaces created by the algorithm. The purpose of the exhaustive search space is to provide easy comparision to appreciate the reduction in search space.

It can be seen that CueNet prunes the search space very differently for different datasets. As we move from dataset to dataset, the data sources present different items of information, and therefore CueNet constructs very search spaces. Dataset D2, D4 and D5 are very large conferences hosting hundreds of people in the same field. This explains why a large portion of the grid is covered. Also, this was the same conference held in three different years, and therefore, had a lot of common attendees resulting in overlap.

5.2.5 Conclusion

These experiments validate our three hypotheses. **First**, Event sources contain a large portion of true positives. From 70% in D1 to 100% in D7. There are events for which there is no documentation, and event sources are not able to contribute anything here, as in the case of D4. **Second**, the discovery algorithm is able to prune the search space using event, personal and social information. The reduction is atleast 50% for D2 (338 candidates out of 660) but can be very large in some cases (7 candidates for D7). **Third**, The reduced search space retains a high number of true positives. The hit rate is between 83% to 100% (with




Figure 5.4: Graph showing the contribution of each source type in context discovery.

the exception of D4, where the search space provided no true positives). We also saw how unique the search spaces are, to each dataset, thereby demonstrating the dynamic nature of the algorithm.

5.3 Known Issues

In this section, we list some of the issues encountered in designing and building CueNet. Some of these are active areas of research, and whereas others are specific to our framework, and can be considered potential areas of research. Our experience with CueNet indicates that the following issues should be approached in a holistic manner, i.e., in conjunction with each other. Approaching these problems in the context of each other reduces the individual complexity of each sub-problem by possibly increasing the complexity of the entire framework, but making the problem more tractable.

Noise in Social Media: The problem of noise filtering in web data is a prominent one, and is

being addressed by various communities in different ways. These range from entity matching and record linkage problems [18] to correcting missing data in information networks [44]. These problems get trickier because of the different variations in representing tiny details such as representation names of people, addresses of places, and time. In fact, there is a whole school of anthroponomastics [47] dedicated to studying variations in human names. Ideas in this field indicate that these differences arise due to cultural, historical and environmental issues[1]. Such issues cannot be trivially addressed.

Face tagging in social media sources like Facebook can also be very noisy. This strictly prohibits directly using this data to train verification/recognition models. Also, the quality of photos are poor, resulting in weaker features, which would have otherwise allowed better matching.

An exhaustive scientific characterization of noise in social media is beyond the scope of this paper, and is being investigated step by step in social media research communities.

CPU Efficiency: The query engine in CueNet is responsible for extracting data from different sources. If a very large number of photos are being tagged, our scheme of query generation and merging will prove inefficient. Processing many photos from different people provides a very rich opportunity to develop interesting heuristics using event semantics for the multi-query optimization problem. Also, partitioning the discovery algorithm such that the computations can occur in a distributed manner is a complex problem. Such steps will be required if the application workload is of the scales of Facebook or processing photos in real time at the scales of Instagram.

Face Verification: Even though face recognition has been studied in research for the last two decades, face verification, and its specific application to faces in the wild has been a relatively recent venture. Although the accuracy of these systems is commendable, the problems of occlusion, image quality, face alignment and differing lighting conditions exist.

These hard problems need to be solved before “perfect” or “near-perfect” verification can be established.

Execution Patterns: When is a good time to execute the algorithm? When a user takes a photo? Or before she uploads it to her favorite photo sharing site? For the current evaluation, contextual sources are assumed to be immutable. This is not true in the real world. Contextual sources are constantly being appended with new information, and old information is being updated. These updates may be vital in tagging a certain photo. So the question of when to execute the algorithm, or how and when to query the sources is an open question. If a large number of photos are to be tagged, and a busy source like Facebook is being used for context, the CueNet query engine must take into account various freshness metrics and crawling policies of the sources.

Open Datasets: The unavailability of a large public data set over which different techniques can be evaluated against each other is an open problem. As seen in our experiments, personal information is vital to contextual approaches, and this data is largely personal, and therefore cannot be shared openly. Optimal anonymization techniques need to be invented such that the privacy of the experiment participants are maintained, and at the same time the data is meaningful to be applied in contextual approaches to problems. This need to be solved so that new context discovery techniques can be evaluated independently and against each other, over a common platform.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Work

Problems/Opportunities:

1. Absence of a language/tool which can be used to express real world models. Ontologies are logic driven. Usually deal with true/false.
2. Starting points of such a language – physical variables, graphics world modeling, entity identification.
3. Backtracking based algorithms.

Bibliography

- [1] A. W. Q. G. Al-Zumor. A socio-cultural and linguistic analysis of yemeni arabic personal names. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies*, 9(2):15–27, 2009.
- [2] J. F. Allen. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Communications of the ACM*, 26(11):832–843, 1983.
- [3] M. Ames and M. Naaman. Why we tag: motivations for annotation in mobile and online media. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. ACM, 2007.
- [4] L. Backstrom, D. Huttenlocher, J. Kleinberg, and X. Lan. Group formation in large social networks: membership, growth, and evolution. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 44–54. ACM, 2006.
- [5] P. Barthelmess, E. Kaiser, and D. McGee. Toward content-aware multimodal tagging of personal photo collections. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Multimodal interfaces*. ACM, 2007.
- [6] P. Belhumeur, J. Hespanha, and D. Kriegman. Eigenfaces vs. fisherfaces: Recognition using class specific linear projection. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 19(7), 1997.
- [7] M. Boutell and J. Luo. Photo classification by integrating image content and camera metadata. In *Pattern Recognition, 2004. ICPR 2004. Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on*, volume 4. IEEE, 2004.
- [8] M. Boutell and J. Luo. Beyond pixels: Exploiting camera metadata for photo classification. *Pattern recognition*, 38(6), 2005.
- [9] L. Cao, J. Luo, and T. Huang. Annotating photo collections by label propagation according to multiple similarity cues. In *Proceeding of the 16th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2008.
- [10] L. Cao, J. Luo, H. Kautz, and T. Huang. Annotating collections of photos using hierarchical event and scene models. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2008. CVPR 2008. IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2008.

- [11] G. Chen and D. Kotz. A survey of context-aware mobile computing research. 2000.
- [12] N. Dalal and B. Triggs. Histograms of oriented gradients for human detection. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2005. IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, volume 1. IEEE.
- [13] R. Datta, D. Joshi, J. Li, and J. Wang. Image retrieval: Ideas, influences, and trends of the new age. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 40(2), 2008.
- [14] A. K. Dey. Understanding and using context. *Personal and ubiquitous computing*, 5(1):4–7, 2001.
- [15] N. Diakopoulos and P. Chiu. Photoplay: A collocated collaborative photo tagging game on a horizontal display. *UIST Adjunct Proceedings*, 2007.
- [16] A. Doan and A. Y. Halevy. Semantic integration research in the database community: A brief survey. *AI magazine*, 26(1):83, 2005.
- [17] S. Dumais, E. Cutrell, J. Cadiz, G. Jancke, R. Sarin, and D. Robbins. Stuff i've seen: a system for personal information retrieval and re-use. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval*. ACM, 2003.
- [18] A. K. Elmagarmid, P. G. Ipeirotis, and V. S. Verykios. Duplicate record detection: A survey. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 19(1), 2007.
- [19] J. R. Finkel, T. Grenager, and C. Manning. Incorporating non-local information into information extraction systems by gibbs sampling. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 363–370. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2005.
- [20] D. Frohlich, A. Kuchinsky, C. Pering, A. Don, and S. Ariss. Requirements for photoware. In *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*. ACM, 2002.
- [21] J. Gemmell, G. Bell, R. Lueder, S. Drucker, and C. Wong. Mylifebits: fulfilling the memex vision. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM international conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2002.
- [22] A. Graham, H. Garcia-Molina, A. Paepcke, and T. Winograd. Time as essence for photo browsing through personal digital libraries. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM/IEEE-CS joint conference on Digital libraries*. ACM, 2002.
- [23] A. Gupta and R. Jain. Managing event information: Modeling, retrieval, and applications. *Synthesis Lectures on Data Management*, 3(4), 2011.
- [24] J. Hailpern, N. Jitkoff, A. Warr, K. Karahalios, R. Sesek, and N. Shkrob. Youpivot: improving recall with contextual search. In *Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference on Human factors in computing systems*. ACM, 2011.

- [25] A. Y. Halevy. Answering queries using views: A survey. *The VLDB JournalThe International Journal on Very Large Data Bases*, 10(4):270–294, 2001.
- [26] J. Hays and A. Efros. Im2gps: estimating geographic information from a single image. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2008. CVPR 2008. IEEE Conference on*. Ieee, 2008.
- [27] K. Henricksen, J. Indulska, and A. Rakotonirainy. Modeling context information in pervasive computing systems. In *Pervasive Computing*, pages 167–180. Springer, 2002.
- [28] D. Henter, D. Borth, and A. Ulges. Tag suggestion on youtube by personalizing content-based auto-annotation. In *Proceedings of the ACM multimedia 2012 workshop on Crowd-sourcing for multimedia*, pages 41–46. ACM, 2012.
- [29] J. R. Hobbs and F. Pan. Time ontology in owl. w3c working draft, 27 september 2006. *World Wide Web Consortium*. <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl-time>, 2006.
- [30] R. Jain and P. Sinha. Content without context is meaningless. In *Proceedings of the international conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2010.
- [31] M. J. Krawczyk. Communities in social networks. In *Biometrics and Kansei Engineering, 2009. ICBAKE 2009. International Conference on*, pages 111–116. IEEE, 2009.
- [32] N. Kumar, A. C. Berg, P. N. Belhumeur, and S. K. Nayar. Describable visual attributes for face verification and image search. In *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, October 2011.
- [33] M. Lenzerini. Data integration: A theoretical perspective. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 233–246. ACM, 2002.
- [34] X. Li, C. G. Snoek, M. Worring, and A. W. Smeulders. Fusing concept detection and geo context for visual search. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, page 4. ACM, 2012.
- [35] F. Monaghan and D. O’Sullivan. Automating photo annotation using services and ontologies. In *Mobile Data Management, 2006. MDM 2006. 7th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2006.
- [36] G. K. Mostefaoui, J. Pasquier-Rocha, and P. Brezillon. Context-aware computing: a guide for the pervasive computing community. In *Pervasive Services, 2004. ICPS 2004. IEEE/ACS International Conference on*, pages 39–48. IEEE, 2004.
- [37] M. Naaman. *Leveraging geo-referenced digital photographs*. PhD thesis, Citeseer, 2005.
- [38] M. Naaman, R. Yeh, H. Garcia-Molina, and A. Paepcke. Leveraging context to resolve identity in photo albums. In *Digital Libraries, 2005. JCDL’05. Proceedings of the 5th ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on*. IEEE, 2005.

- [39] B. Nowack. Confoto: Browsing and annotating conference photos on the semantic web. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web*, 4(4), 2006.
- [40] N. O'Hare and A. Smeaton. Context-aware person identification in personal photo collections. *Multimedia, IEEE Transactions on*, 11(2), 2009.
- [41] D. J. Patterson. *Assisted cognition: compensatory activity assistance technology*. PhD thesis, 2005.
- [42] T. Rattenbury and M. Naaman. Methods for extracting place semantics from flickr tags. *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)*, 3(1), 2009.
- [43] P. Reignier, O. Brdiczka, D. Vaufreydaz, J. L. Crowley, and J. Maisonnasse. Context-aware environments: from specification to implementation. *Expert systems*, 24(5):305–320, 2007.
- [44] E. Sadikov, M. Medina, J. Leskovec, and H. Garcia-Molina. Correcting for missing data in information cascades. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 55–64. ACM, 2011.
- [45] N. Sawant, J. Li, and J. Wang. Automatic image semantic interpretation using social action and tagging data. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 2011.
- [46] B. Schilit, N. Adams, and R. Want. Context-aware computing applications. In *Mobile Computing Systems and Applications, 1994. WMCSA 1994. First Workshop on*, pages 85–90. IEEE, 1994.
- [47] M. Schneider. What's in my name? toward a generative anthroponomastics. *Anthro-poetics*, 15(1):1–9, 2009.
- [48] D. Siewiorek, A. Smailagic, J. Furukawa, A. Krause, N. Moraveji, K. Reiger, J. Shaffer, and F. L. Wong. Sensay: A context-aware mobile phone. In *Proceedings of the 7th IEEE International Symposium on Wearable Computers*, volume 248, 2003.
- [49] P. Sinha and R. Jain. Concept annotation and search space decrement of digital photos using optical context information. In *Electronic Imaging 2008*, pages 68200H–68200H. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2008.
- [50] Z. Stone, T. Zickler, and T. Darrell. Autotagging facebook: Social network context improves photo annotation. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPRW'08*. IEEE, 2008.
- [51] M. Turk and A. Pentland. Eigenfaces for recognition. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, 3(1), 1991.
- [52] V. Vieira, P. Tedesco, and A. C. Salgado. Designing context-sensitive systems: An integrated approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(2):1119–1138, 2011.
- [53] U. Westermann and R. Jain. Toward a common event model for multimedia applications. *Multimedia, IEEE*, 14(1):19–29, 2007.

- [54] F. Wolter and M. Zakharyaschev. Spatio-temporal representation and reasoning based on rcc-8. *KR2000: Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, 2000.
- [55] J. Xiao, J. Hays, K. Ehinger, A. Oliva, and A. Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *Computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR), 2010 IEEE conference on*. IEEE, 2010.
- [56] R. Yerneni, C. Li, H. Garcia-Molina, and J. Ullman. Computing capabilities of mediators. *ACM Sigmod Record*, 28(2):443–454, 1999.

Appendix A

Appendix

Supplementary material goes here.

A.1 Source Mapping

```
(:source google-calendar
  (:attrs event email time location title description attendee)
  (:rel ev type-of event)
  (:rel owner type-of person)
  (:rel ti type-of time-interval)
  (:rel ev occurs-during ti)
  (:rel participant type-of person)
  (:rel owner participant-of ev)
  (:rel participant participant-of ev)
  (:io disk (:db mongodb))
  (:type personal)
```

```

(:axioms
  (:map ev event)
  (:map ti time)
  (:map owner.email email B)
  (:map ev.occurs-during time)
  (:map ev.occurs-at location)
  (:map participant attendee)
  (:map ev.title title U)
  (:map ev.description description U)))

(:source fb-user
  (:attrs id name birthday location work email)
  (:rel person type-of person)
  (:rel named-place type-of named-place)
  (:rel address type-of address)
  (:rel person works-at named-place)
  (:rel person lives-at address)
  (:io disk (:db mongodb))
  (:type personal)

  (:axioms
    (:map person.name name)
    (:map person.dob birthday)
    (:map address.street-address location.name)
    (:map named-place.name work.name)))))

(:source email

```

```

(:attrs from to cc)
(:rel pf type-of person)
(:rel pt type-of person)
(:rel pc type-of person)
(:io disk (:db mongodb))
(:type personal)
(:axioms
  (:map pf.email from)
  (:map pt.email to)
  (:map pc.email cc)))

```

```

(:source fb-relation
(:attrs name1 name2)
(:rel p1 type-of person)
(:rel p2 type-of person)
(:rel p1 knows p2)
(:io disk (:db mongodb))
(:type personal)
(:axioms
  (:map p1.name name1 F)
  (:map p2.name name2 U)))

```

```

(:source academix
(:attrs name1 name2)
(:rel p1 type-of person)
(:rel p2 type-of person)

```

```

(:rel p1 knows p2)
(:io disk (:db mongodb))
(:type public)
(:axioms
  (:map p1.name name1 F)
  (:map p2.name name2 U)))

(:source conferences
  (:attrs time location ltitle stitle url)
  (:rel conf type-of event)
  (:rel time type-of time-interval)
  (:rel loc type-of location)
  (:rel conf occurs-at location)
  (:rel conf occurs-during time)
  (:axioms
    (:map time time)
    (:map loc location)
    (:map conf.title ltitle)
    (:map conf.name stitle)
    (:map conf.url url)))
  )

(:source confattendees
  (:attrs url name time location ltitle stitle)
  (:rel conf type-of conference)
  (:rel time type-of time-interval)
  (:rel loc type-of location)

```

```

(:rel attendee type-of person)
(:rel attendee participant-in conf)
(:rel conf occurs-at location)
(:rel conf occurs-during time)
(:axioms
  (:map time time)
  (:map loc location)
  (:map conf.title ltitle)
  (:map conf.name stitle)
  (:map conf.url url)
  (:map attendee.name name)))
(:source keynotes
  (:attrs url time location title name)
  (:rel conf type-of conference)
  (:rel k type-of keynote)
  (:rel k subevent-of conf)
  (:rel attendee participant-in k)
  (:axioms
    (:map conf.url url)
    (:map attendee.name name)
    (:map k.location location)
    (:map k.time time)
    (:map k.title title)))
(:source sessions

```

```

(:attrs url time location title name)
(:rel conf type-of conference)
(:rel k type-of session)
(:rel k subevent-of conf)
(:rel attendee participant-in k)
(:axioms
  (:map conf.url url)
  (:map attendee.name name)
  (:map k.location location)
  (:map k.time time)
  (:map k.title title)))
(:source talks
  (:attrs url time location title name)
  (:rel conf type-of conference)
  (:rel k type-of talk)
  (:rel k subevent-of conf)
  (:rel attendee participant-in k)
  (:axioms
    (:map conf.url url)
    (:map attendee.name name)
    (:map k.location location)
    (:map k.time time)
    (:map k.title title)))
(:source conflunches

```

```

(:attrs url time location title name)
(:rel conf type-of conference)
(:rel k type-of lunch)
(:rel k subevent-of conf)
(:rel attendee participant-in k)
(:axioms
  (:map conf.url url)
  (:map attendee.name name)
  (:map k.location location)
  (:map k.time time)
  (:map k.title title)))

(:source tweets
  (:attrs url name)
  (:rel conf type-of conference)
  (:rel attendee type-of person)
  (:rel attendee participant-in conf)
  (:axioms
    (:map conf.url url)
    (:map attendee.name name)))

(:source fb-events
  (:attrs event name time)
  (:rel ev type-of event)
  (:rel p1 type-of person)
  (:rel ti type-of time-interval))

```

```
(:rel ev occurs-during ti)
(:rel p1 participant-of ev)
(:axioms
  (:map p1.name name)
  (:map ev event)
  (:map ev.occurs-during time)
  (:map ti time)))
```