

Experiments Around Training Data Selection Methods for Image Classification

Department of Statistics Data Analysis Qualifying Exam

John Koo

Problem Statement and Objective

- ▶ Deep convolutional neural networks make use of the current wealth of curated image datasets and computational resources

Problem Statement and Objective

- ▶ Deep convolutional neural networks make use of the current wealth of curated image datasets and computational resources
- ▶ CNNs may fit poorly when there is insufficient data, and the data collection and labelling process can be expensive

Problem Statement and Objective


- ▶ Deep convolutional neural networks make use of the current wealth of curated image datasets and computational resources
- ▶ CNNs may fit poorly when there is insufficient data, and the data collection and labelling process can be expensive
- ▶ Goal: Determine a training set sampling method to select the best possible images under a fixed training set size

Problem Statement and Objective

- ▶ Deep convolutional neural networks make use of the current wealth of curated image datasets and computational resources
- ▶ CNNs may fit poorly when there is insufficient data, and the data collection and labelling process can be expensive
- ▶ Goal: Determine a training set sampling method to select the best possible images under a fixed training set size
- ▶ Largely based on a paper by Crandall et al. (2018)

Background: “Toddler-Inspired Visual Object Learning”



- ▶ Compared images taken by first-person cameras mounted on toddlers and parents
- ▶ Training VGG16 using toddler data resulted in higher test accuracy than training on parent data (same test set in both cases)



Background: “Toddler-Inspired Visual Object Learning”

- ▶ Distilled the differences in the datasets into two components: object size (how much of the image does the object take up) and image “diversity” (hard to measure)
- ▶ Subsampled the images to obtain training subsets of:
 - ▶ big objects
 - ▶ small objects
 - ▶ diverse images
 - ▶ similar images
 - ▶ random subset
- ▶ Image similarity/distance based on an image embedding (GIST features)
- ▶ Found that when objects are larger or when images are more diverse, test accuracy improves

Background: “Toddler-Inspired Visual Object Learning”




Outline and Summary

1. Replication studies
2. New methods for training data selection
3. Results
4. Conclusions and future work



Replication Study: Stanford Dogs dataset

- ▶ 20,000 images of 120 dog breeds
- ▶ 100 images per breed set aside for training
 - ▶ further subdivided into 50-50 big/small or diverse/similar
- ▶ 25 images per breed set aside for validation
- ▶ Remainder for testing



Replication Study: Stanford Dogs dataset

- ▶ Some evidence that object size affects training
- ▶ No significant evidence that image diversity affects training



Replication Study: CIFAR-10

CIFAR-10


- ▶ 32×32 RGB images of 10 different object classes
- ▶ 5,000 training and 1,000 testing images per class
- ▶ No bounding box information
 - ▶ Diversity experiment only
 - ▶ No adjusting field of view

Sampling method

1. Choose training size n
2. Draw $2n$ images using diverse, similar, or random sampling
3. Split the data in half for training and validation
4. Fit VGG16 and assess accuracy on the test set

Replication Study: CIFAR-10

airplane



automobile



bird



cat



deer




dog




frog



horse




ship






truck




Diverse vs. Similar Samples from a Point Cloud




Diverse vs. Similar vs. Random Samples of CIFAR-10 Cats



Replication Study: CIFAR-10



New Approaches to Training Set Selection



Wilson Editing

- ▶ Originally developed for k -nearest neighbors
- ▶ Algorithm
 1. Start with a sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and corresponding discrete labels $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \{1, \dots, q\}$
 2. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, determine \hat{Y}_i using leave-one-out cross-validated k -nearest neighbors classification
 3. Discard $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ where $Y_i \neq \hat{Y}_i$ to construct a reduced, “edited” training set
 4. Use the edited training set to fit a new k -nearest neighbors model
- ▶ Outperforms “unedited” k -nearest neighbors (comparing risk on a held-out test set)


► Algorithm

1. Use Wilson editing (using the GIST embedding) to reduce the training set
2. For a training size n , draw a diverse sample from the edited training set
3. Fit VGG16 on the diverse, edited training subset
4. Assess model performance on the test set


► Idea: Draw a diverse sample while excluding “outliers”

Wilson Editing

Editing done prior to drawing diverse samples




Effect of editing prior to drawing diverse samples



Clustering

Algorithm


1. Use k -means clustering (using the GIST embedding) to split each class into “subclasses”
2. For a training size n , draw a cluster/subclass-stratified sample
3. Fit VGG16 on the stratified training subset
4. Assess model performance on the test set



Summary and Conclusions

- ▶ Diverse sampling outperforms similar sampling but fails to improve upon uniform random sampling
- ▶ Removing outlier images prior to drawing a diverse sample seems to improve model performance
- ▶ Cluster-stratified sampling resulted in equivalent model performance as uniform random sampling
- ▶ Future work
 - ▶ More sophisticated clustering methods
 - ▶ Active learning based approaches

Comparison of sampling methods



Additional Slides

GIST Embedding

Transfer Learning