

# REPORT

In this project, we worked on the two separate tasks of :

**-homogeneous and non-homogeneous image dehazing**

**-object detection**

In the first part, we focused on setting up the environment for fine-tuning a pre-existing model specialized in object detection. The model chosen is the state of the art network yolo\_v5. As a preliminary stage, we also decided to experiment with fine-tuning yolo\_v5 directly on the A2I2 dataset, without applying any preliminary data augmentation or dehazing techniques.

First of all, we created our custom fine-tuning dataset based on the training and dry-run set collected from the A2I2 dataset . In order to do so, it was necessary to perform a pre-processing step of the label files in order to comply with the bounding boxes coordinates format expected by the network. Second, we created a custom configuration file for the dataset, in order to set the correct paths to the folders containing images and labels. This file is located at YOLO\_v5/data/A2I2.yaml.

Before proceeding, we also enabled the W&B flow for real time visualization and cloud logging, in order to be able to have a better overview of the QoR of each fine-tuning attempt.

Finally, we proceeded with several fine-tuning attempt playing with some of the hyperparameters leveraged by yolo\_v5 and we finally found an optimal combination for the fine-tuning procedure to be:

-50 epochs

-batch\_size=32

**The results of training are located in the folder runs/train/exp6 while the results of testing are at runs/detect/exp8.**

The second part of the work focused on the task of image de-hazing.

After reviewing the existing literature, we decided to focus on 2 models:

-FFA.

-DWGAN

-AECR-Net

## **FFA.**

-The main advantage of FFA is that it supports a useful fine-tuning API which can be leveraged to improve the model previously trained on the RESIDE dataset.

On the other hand, the problem with this model is that it is characterized by a homogeneous haze-removal approach, meaning that the models tend to remove an equal amount of haze across the entire image. While this might not adapt well to the type of A2I2 dataset that we target, FFA has shown skyrocketing improvements over previous models, which is why we decided to dig further in the model.

In particular, we leveraged the aforementioned API to perform fine-tuning on our dataset with the following call :

```
python main.py --net='ffa' --crop --crop_size=240 --blocks=19 --gps=3 --bs=2 --lr=0.0001  
--trainset='ots_train' --testset='ots_test' --steps=1000000 --eval_step=20
```

Paying attention to decreasing the evaluation step parameter in order to update the model more often.

After that, we run inference on both our training and test images, and we noticed that the results slightly improved after running inferences more than one time recursively on the results from the previous inference. We then passed the arguments to the OBJ\_DETECTION. So first we input as object detection both the training set and test set obtained from one cycle of FFA-net prediction, and keep the same hyperparameters of the previous experiment to see the impact of just one round of FFA-net.

runs/train/exp13 runs/detect/exp23 (conf=0.3) runs/detect/exp24 (conf=0.1)  
runs/detect/exp25 (conf=0.06)

The exp25 is with the same setting and we see a slight decrease of mAP.

Agar-shape on W&B

## DWGAN

-Given the poor performance increase in terms of mAP with FFA, we decided to place some additional effort in exploring other models which adopt non-homogeneous haze removal techniques. Among those, we found DWGAN net to be an interesting test case.

DW-GAN uses a 2D discrete wavelet transform with a focus on non-homogeneous dehazing. It uses a two-branch network to deal with dehazing problems like loss of texture details due to complicated haze distribution and overfitting due to lack of training data. The DWT (Discrete Wavelet Transform) branch can retain more high-frequency knowledge in feature maps and to prevent over-fitting, ImageNet pre-trained Res2Net is adopted in the knowledge adaptation branch.

The main drawback coming with these model are the followings:

- the model accepts 1600x1200 images as input, thus it was necessary to preprocess our training and testing images by applying both resizing and padding. In the same way, we had to reformat the dehazed images before feeding them to YOLOv5.
- The model does not offer a fine-tuning API. For this reason, it was not possible to improve the model by adapting it to our specific domain, which is unfortunate since most of the images of the datasets used for training this model ( RESIDE., NH-HAZE and DENSE-HAZE ) were not taken with the top-down view which characterizes our A2I2 dataset.

Although the model is not optimal for our purposes, it is still offering promising results in the documentation provided by the creators, which is why we used it to augment our dataset with multiple inference experiments.

The summary of the results after applying object detection are showed in swept-firefly-8 experiment (train/exp10 and detect/exp28)

### **-AECR-Net**

This model implements contrastive regularization (CR) built upon contrastive learning with an approach that looks at hazy images and clear images as negative and positive samples, respectively. Contrastive regularization aims to pull the restored image closer to the clear image and away from the hazy image in the latent space. It uses a dehazing network based on an autoencoder-like (AE) framework which implements adaptive mixup operation that benefits from preserving information flow adaptively and a dynamic feature enhancement module that improves the network's transformation capabilities.

First , we just want to see the impact of dehazing and how it affects the downstream object detection quality. So we just run inference on our training and test data (similarly to what was done for DWGAN). Then we pass the dehazed training images to the finetuning of YOLO and finally perform inference with the fine tuned yolo model on the dehazed test images.

SAme setting ( 50 epochs and 32 batch\_size) runs/train/exp15 ( leafy-due on w&b)  
runs/detect/exp29. Submission map 65.618

### **AUGMENTED DATASET EXPERIMENTS:**

At this point, we decided to actually leverage an augmented dataset composed of different training sets obtained by the dehazing methods described above:

#### **1st experiment:**

-initial training set + DWGAN-dehazed training set

-DWGAN-dehazed test set

epochs=70

batch\_size=40

runs/train/exp12 runs/detect/exp21 (conf=0.1) exp22 (conf=0.3) **exp26(conf=0.06 submission map 70,61)** exp27(conf=0.04) (volcan-rain)

SHOW HOW **EXP26** IS BETTER THAN EXP28 THANKS TO DATA AUGMENTATION ( ex: new\_062.jpg, and then prove it by showing the two submission) example

It was interesting that these settings improve the performance with respect to exp26 which only uses DWGAN images.

## **1b experiment:**

ORIGINAL +dwgan+ FFA3

## **2nd experiment:**

-initial training set = the sets of images obtained from FFA ( tested recursively from 1 to 3 times)

**epochs=50**

**batch\_size=32**

**runs/train/exp16**

## **3th experiment:**

Further data augmentation: combine in the training set DWGAN, FFA, and AECRNET outputs