Deep Learning Techniques in Urban Security Perception Analysis

Felipe A. Moreno

Advisor: Prof. Jorge Poco

About me

M.Sc. Felipe A. Moreno
www.fmorenovr.com



Content

Motivation

Which one looks safer?

Bangú (RJ)



City Center (RJ)

Place Pulse



http://pulse.media.mit.edu/

* Comparisons were made using two random images from random cities.

Place Pulse Dataset

Place Pulse 1.0:

- 73 806 Comparisons, 4 136 images
- 2 Countries (US y Austria)
- 4 cities: New York City, Boston, Linz and Salzburg
- 3 categories: Safe, Wealth and Unique



Place Pulse 2.0:

- 1 223 649 Comparisons, 111 390 images
- 32 countries
- 56 cities
- 6 categories: Safe, Wealth, Depress, Beautiful, Boring, and Lively



* **Remember:** We will focus in **Place Pulse 2.0** only.

Methodology

Pipeline


(I) Input data
0.55
1.29
5.01
7.16
8.35
(II) Exploratory Analysis
Scores distributions by Geographical level
Imbalance of samples per city
(III) Classifiers
Supervised Learning
Semi-Supervised Learning
Baseline models
GAN model
(IV) Model comparisons

Data Pre-processing

Dataset sample: Set of comparisons*

left_id	right_id	winner	left_lat	left_long	right_lat	right_long	category
513d7e23fdc9f	513d7ac3fdc9f	equal	40.744156	-73.93557	-33.52638	-70.591309	depressing
513f320cfdc9f	513cc3acfdc9f	left	52.551685	13.416548	29.76381	-95.394621	safety
513e5dc3fdc9f	5140d960fdc9f	right	48.878382	2.403116	53.32932	-6.231007	lively

* **Remember:** Comparisons were made using two random images from random cities.

Pre-processing Comparisons

Perceptual Scores Approach

Salesse et. al, “The Collaborative Image of The City: Mapping the Inequality of Urban Perception”, 2013

$$W_i = \frac{w_i}{w_i + d_i + l_i}$$

$$L_i = \frac{l_i}{w_i + d_i + l_i}$$

$$q_{i,k} = \frac{10}{3}(W_{i,k} + \frac{1}{n^w_{i,k}}(\sum_{j_1} W_{j_1,k}) - \frac{1}{n^l_{i,k}}(\sum_{j_2} L_{j_2,k}) + 1)$$

*Nassar et al, “The evaluative image of the city”, 1990

Rank Images Approach

Dubey et. al, “Deep Learning the City : Quantifying Urban Perception At A Global Scale”, 2016

$$\mu_x \longleftarrow \mu_x + \frac{\sigma_x^2}{c} \cdot f\left(\frac{(\mu_x - \mu_y)}{c}, \frac{\varepsilon}{c}\right)$$

$$\mu_y \longleftarrow \mu_y - \frac{\sigma_y^2}{c} \cdot f\left(\frac{(\mu_x - \mu_y)}{c}, \frac{\varepsilon}{c}\right)$$

$$\sigma_x^2 \longleftarrow \sigma_x^2 \cdot \left[1 - \frac{\sigma_x^2}{c} \cdot g\left(\frac{(\mu_x - \mu_y)}{c}, \frac{\varepsilon}{c}\right)\right]$$

$$\sigma_y^2 \longleftarrow \sigma_y^2 \cdot \left[1 - \frac{\sigma_y^2}{c} \cdot g\left(\frac{(\mu_x - \mu_y)}{c}, \frac{\varepsilon}{c}\right)\right]$$

$$c^2 = 2\beta^2 + \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2$$

$$q_{i,k} = \frac{10}{c_{max,k}}(c_{i,k})$$

**Minka et al, “TrueSkill 2: An improved Bayesian skill rating system”, 2018

Perceptual Score Approach

$$W_i = \frac{w_i}{w_i + d_i + l_i} \qquad L_i = \frac{l_i}{w_i + d_i + l_i}$$

$$q^*_{i,k} = \frac{10}{3}(W_i + \frac{1}{w_i}(\sum_{k_1=1}^{w_i} V_w(k_1)) - \frac{1}{l_i}(\sum_{k_2=1}^{l_i} V_l(k_2)) + 1)$$

Salesse et. al, “The Collaborative Image of The City: Mapping the Inequality of Urban Perception”, 2013

*Nassar et al, “The evaluative image of the city”, 1990

Processed sample: Images from Rio de Janeiro - Place Pulse 2.0

Image	ID	Safety	Lively	Wealthy	Beauty	Boring	Depressive
	513d7e23fdc9f	7.42	8.58	6.5	7.3	2.64	1.23
	513f320cfdc9f	6.07	4.97	7.13	8.61	1.67	0.86

* **Note:** We perform the calculation in all categories, but we will focus in safety only.

Dataset Statistics: summary

Place Pulse 1.0				
City	# images	*safe mean*	*wealth mean*	*unique mean*
Linz	650	4.85	5.01	4.83
Boston	1237	4.93	4.97	4.76
New York	1705	4.47	4.31	4.46
Salzburg	544	4.75	4.89	5.04
Total	4136			

Place Pulse 2.0			
Continent	#countries	#cities	#images
Europe	19	22	38,747
North America	3	17	37504
South America	2	5	12,524
Asia	5	7	11,417
Oceania	1	2	6,097
Africa	2	3	5,101
Total	32	56	111,390

Place Pulse 2.0			
Category	# comparisons	# images	*mean*
Safety	368,926	111,389	5.188
Lively	267,292	111,348	5.085
Beautiful	175,361	110,766	4.920
Wealthy	152,241	107,795	4.890
Depressing	132,467	105,495	4.816
Boring	127,362	106,363	4.810
Total	1,223,649		

Exploratory Analysis

Number of images per continent



Number of comparisons



* **Remember:** Comparisons were made using two random images from two random cities.

Geographical city distribution: Cities included in Place Pulse 2.0

* **Note:** Same color means same country.

Number of images per geographical level

Place Pulse 2.0				
Category/Level	City	Country	Continent	Global
safety	20,143	45,640	85,890	111,390
lively	14,803	38,216	79,788	111,349
Beautiful	9,410	28,811	66,792	110,767
Wealthy	7,642	24,326	57,780	107,796
Depressing	6,556	21,171	52,504	105,496
Boring	6,148	20,931	52,031	106,364

Dataset Limitations

Individual perception

	Safe perception	Unsafe perception
New York*		
Tokyo**		

*https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/08/nyregion/newyorktoday/times-square-panic-safety.html#:~:text=Actually%2C%20Times%20Square%20is%20one,23%2C000%20major%20crimes%20were%20recorded.

**https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/10/04/national/media-national/rip-off-bars-japan-tourist-boom/

Lack of samples: Identify city characteristics individually

Place Pulse 1.0 < 4 140 Images & Place Pulse 2.0 < 112 000 Images



Imbalance of samples: e.g. Safety category perception



* **Note:** Some cities have more “not safe” sample than safe samples. E.g. Brazilian cities.

Imbalance of samples: e.g. Chicago vs Rio de Janeiro



*Positive Samples: safe, beautiful, wealthy, lively, not depressing, not boring.

*Negative Samples: not safe, not beautiful, not wealthy, not lively, depressing, boring.

Non-Reliable Score Distribution

	City	Country	Continent	Global
World				
Rio de Janeiro				

Dataset Images: Faulty/Blank/None samples







Dataset Images: Different Point of View of Sample Images






Urban Safety Perception

Data Analysis & Preparation

Processed data: Perceptual scores

left	right	winner
		draw
		left
		right
. . .	. . .	. . .
		right
		left

$$\hat{y}_{i,k} = q_{i,k}$$

I:
(X,Y)

Image	Perceptual Scores
	8.35
	7.16
. . .	
	5.01
. . .	
	1.29
	0.55

Labeling data: From real values to categorical

We define a parameter δ which will helps to labeling our data.

$$\hat{y}_{i,k} = q_{i,k}$$

$$y_{i,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (q_{i,k}) \text{in the top } \delta\% \\ \text{-1} & \text{if } (q_{i,k}) \text{in the bottom } \delta\% \end{cases}$$

Processed data: Perceptual classes

left	right	winner
		draw
		left
		right
. . .	. . .	. . .
		right
		left

$$y_{i,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (q_{i,k}) \text{in the top } \delta\% \\ -1 & \text{if } (q_{i,k}) \text{in the bottom } \delta\% \end{cases}$$

I: (X,{1,-1})

Image | Perceptual Scores

 , 8.35

 , 7.16

. . .

 , 5.01

. . .

 , 1.29

 , 0.55

Top δ%: 1

Bottom δ%: -1 or 0

Perceptual Category



Evaluating different values of δ



Models Configurations

Baseline model: Transfer Learning (TL) & Fine Tuning (FT)



* **Input shape:** 224x224.
* Using VGG, ResNet, and Xception

Baseline GAP model: Transfer Learning (TL) & Fine Tuning (FT)



* **Input shape:** 224x224.
* Using VGG, ResNet, and Xception

GAN model: Train from scratch discriminator & generator



* **Input shape:** 32x32.

GAN model: Discriminator configuration

Discriminator					
Layer	Input	Channels	*Kernel size*	*Stride*	Activation
Conv	$32 \times 32 \times 3$	32	3×3	1	LeakyReLU
Conv	$32 \times 32 \times 32$	32	3×3	2	LeakyReLU
DropOut (0.2)	$16 \times 16 \times 32$	-	-	-	-
Conv	$16 \times 16 \times 32$	64	3×3	1	LeakyReLU
Conv	$16 \times 16 \times 64$	64	3×3	2	LeakyReLU
DropOut (0.2)	$8 \times 8 \times 64$	-	-	-	-
Conv	$8 \times 8 \times 64$	128	3×3	1	LeakyReLU
Conv	$8 \times 8 \times 128$	128	3×3	2	LeakyReLU
DropOut (0.2)	$4 \times 4 \times 128$	-	-	-	-
Conv	$4 \times 4 \times 128$	256	3×3	1	LeakyReLU
Flatten	$4 \times 4 \times 256$	-	-	-	-
Dense	128	-	-	-	-
DropOut (0.4)	128	-	-	-	-
Dense	3	-	-	-	Softmax
Total parameters	1 107 882				

GAN model: Generator configuration

Generator					
Layer	Input	Channels	*Kernel size*	*Stride*	Activation
Latent	100	-	-	-	-
Dense	4096	-	-	-	LeakyReLU
Re-shape	$4 \times 4 \times 256$	-	-	-	-
Deconv	$4 \times 4 \times 256$	256	4×4	2	LeakyReLU
Deconv	$8 \times 8 \times 256$	128	4×4	2	LeakyReLU
Deconv	$16 \times 16 \times 128$	64	4×4	2	LeakyReLU
Conv	$32 \times 32 \times 64$	3	3×3	1	Tanh
Total parameters	2 119 811				

Models parameters and hyperparameters

Summary of model parameters							
Name	**Model hyperparameters**						**Data**
Method	Input	*Batch*	*Opt*	*LR*	*Ep/It*	*CV*	Geo. level
TL_VGG	4096	-	lbfgs	-	1000	5	Global/City
TL_VGG_GAP	512	-	lbfgs	-	1000	5	Global//city
FT_VGG	$224 \times 224 \times 3$	128	Adam	$1e^{-3}$	100	5	Global/City
FT_VGG_GAP	$224 \times 224 \times 3$	128	Adam	$1e^{-3}$	100	5	Global/City
SSL_GAN_Dis	$32 \times 32 \times 3$	128	Adam	$1e^{-3}$	100	5	Global
SSL_GAN_Gen	100	128	Adam	$1e^{-3}$	100	5	Global

* **Parameters were found using GridSearchCV.**

Experiments & Results

Environment

- We divide data to **80**% to train set and **20**% to test set.
- Trained on GPU NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1070, 8 Gb VRAM.
- We use a **StratifiedKFold** to avoid classes disproportion.
- We perform 5 cross-validation for each experiment over the train set using **25**% to validation set.
- We use EarlyStop in 30 epochs and DecayLR every 8 epochs.

Metrics

- **Accuracy** — ***What percent of the data were predicted correct?***
- **Precision** — ***What percent of your predictions were correct?***
- **Recall** — ***What percent of the positive cases did you catch?***
- **F1 score** — ***What percent of positive predictions were correct?***

$$Accuracy = \frac{T_P + T_N}{T_P + T_N + F_P + F_N}$$

$$Precision = \frac{T_P}{T_P + F_P}$$

$$Recall = \frac{T_P}{T_P + F_N}$$

$$F1_{score} = 2\frac{Precision * Recall}{Precision + Recall}$$

Data Split: K-fold cross validation



* We use 20% of the training set to validation set.
* All results presented are corresponding to test data

Transfer-Learning models results













* Results of testing using different values of δ.

Transfer-Learning models results

		auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Model	Method	train	eval	train	eval	entrena	eval
VGG	*LinearSVC*	63.62	56.50	68.85	65.22	54.78	**49.41**
	Logistic	60.63	**57.52**	67.25	**65.72**	51.42	49.07
	Ridge Classifier	64.72	54.75	69.44	64.38	56.50	49.34
	RBF SVC	45.14	42.42	52.13	52.37	46.93	46.59
VGG_GAP	*LinearSVC*	59.01	**57.93**	66.51	**66.09**	49.52	49.06
	Logistic	58.07	57.57	65.95	65.59	46.06	45.61
	Ridge Classifier	59.20	57.93	66.59	65.89	50.27	**49.76**
	RBF SVC	42.93	41.70	50.25	50.35	47.16	46.75

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

Transfer-Learning models results

		auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Model	Method	train	eval	train	eval	entrena	eval
VGG_Places	*LinearSVC*	64.44	57.14	69.48	65.79	56.39	51.20
	Logistic	61.74	**58.35**	68.16	**66.44**	53.77	**51.28**
	Ridge Classifier	65.20	55.76	69.84	64.86	57.56	50.67
	RBF SVC	47.32	45.25	56.56	55.69	44.78	44.21
VGG_GAP_Places	*LinearSVC*	60.26	**59.76**	67.38	**66.96**	51.65	51.04
	Logistic	59.40	58.97	66.81	66.62	49.16	48.90
	Ridge Classifier	60.45	59.15	67.45	66.94	52.23	**51.53**
	RBF SVC	44.40	42.47	52.59	52.54	43.39	45.05

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

Transfer-Learning models results

		auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Model	Method	train	eval	train	eval	entrena	eval
ResNet50	*Linear SVC*	61.62	59.10	68.10	**66.42**	53.63	50.80
	Logistic	60.04	**59.15**	67.25	66.37	51.47	49.70
	Ridge Classifier	62.11	58.38	68.36	66.08	54.59	**51.00**
	RBF SVC	45.36	44.07	53.46	53.57	44.99	44.98
Xception	*LinearSVC*	55.29	**53.25**	64.43	**63.33**	41.66	39.69
	Logistic Regression	53.48	52.75	63.56	63.14	36.72	35.87
	Ridge Classifier	57.23	52.22	65.22	63.04	45.63	42.11
	RBF SVC	45.575	44.99	49.12	49.12	55.01	**55.05**

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

Fine-Tuned models results

	auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Models "FT"	train	eval	train	eval	train	eval
VGG	77.83	**77.42**	74.01	64.71	74.01	64.69
VGG_GAP	76.145	75.59	69.40	66.88	69.41	66.87
VGG_Places	77.98	77.35	70.52	**67.28**	70.52	**67.28**
VGG_GAP_Places	74.95	74.75	68.71	67.26	68.71	67.27
ResNet50	76.362	72.71	70.36	65.64	67.35	64.98

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

GAN model results

		auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Model 32x32x3	CV	train	eval	train	eval	train	eval
SSL_GAN	0	80.95	80.97	90.26	59.06	90.26	59.04
	1	81.43	81.45	89.42	61.50	89.42	61.48
	2	81.43	**81.45**	89.56	**62.58**	89.56	**62.57**
	3	80.59	80.66	90.01	61.52	90.01	61.54
	4	80.61	80.63	89.38	61.14	89.38	61.13

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

GAN model results



GAN model results

			auc		*accuracy*		*f1 score*	
Model 32x32x3	CV	iteration	train	eval	train	eval	train	eval
SSL_GAN	0	23788	73.89	73.89	78.90	78.12	78.90	78.12
	1	58550	80.21	**80.22**	92.18	**81.25**	92.18	**81.25**
	2	21951	73.60	73.60	81.25	79.68	81.25	79.68
	3	23180	73.53	73.53	76.56	78.90	76.56	78.90
	4	8602	69.84	69.84	74.21	78.90	74.21	78.90

* **Results of testing using all dataset.**

GAN model results

Simple Landscape to show results

Metodo	Metrics		all
RidgeClassifier	Train set	AUC	0.6018
		ACC	0.67356
		F1	0.51896
	Test set	AUC	0.59534
		ACC	0.66687
		F1	0.50497
LogisticRegressi			
LinearSVC			
rbfSVC			

features: vgg16, city: World, metric: safety, and method RidgeClassifier









Training time

	Training time for each model	
Method	Data	Average Time
SSL_GAN	Global	1 and a half week
FT_VGG	Global	8 hours
FT_VGG	56 Cities	6 hours
FT_VGG_GAP	Global	7 hours
FT_VGG_GAP	56 Cities	5 hours
TL_VGG	Global	15 minutes
TL_VGG	56 Cities	10 minutes
TL_VGG_GAP	Global	9 minutes
TL_VGG_GAP	56 Cities	6 minutes

* Training time using the environment described above.

Conclusions

Main Contributions

- We propose a methodology to analyze the Place Pulse 2.0 dataset since we thought that is better to focus on data first instead of model complexity.
- We show Place Pulse dataset limitations, some of them based on how the dataset was built and others based on the pre-processing.
- We show that in order to get a better performance in how to differentiate safe characteristics, a semi-supervised model fits the necessity of training this complex dataset with the limitations explained before.
- We solved the problem of imbalance, individual city identification, and lack of samples per city using a semi-supervised GAN model. In other words, we can fix 3 dataset limitations in Place Pulse.

Publications

- Felipe Moreno-Vera, Bahram Lavi, and Jorge Poco. “**Quantifying Urban Safety Perception on Street View Images**”. In IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI-IAT ’21), December 14–17, 2021, Essedon, Australia.

- Felipe Moreno-Vera, Bahram Lavi, and Jorge Poco. “**Urban Perception: Can We Understand Why a Street Is Safe?”**. In Mexican International Conference on Artificial Intelligence (MICAI ’21), October 25-30, 2021, Mexico City, Mexico.

- Felipe Moreno-Vera. “**Understanding Safety based on Urban Perception**”. In International Conference on Intelligent Computing (ICIC ’21), August 12-15, 2021, Shenzhen, China.

Questions?