

Informative Object Annotations - "Tell Me Something I Don't Know"

The Problem of Informative Labeling

People effortlessly decide what an image is "about", extracting informative relevant labels.

Automated classifiers can produce many technically correct labels, which may not be useful for communicating with people.

The Learning Setup

A speaker receives many machine-generated labels, selects k labels to communicate to a listener.



Theories of Relevant Communication

- Basic Level Categories Rosch, 1976 People prefer "intermediate" categories.
- Cooperative Principles (Grice Maxims) Grice, 1975 Be as informative as possible; give as much information as is needed, and no more.

• **Relevance Theory** Wilson & Sperber, 1995 Be compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences.

Goal: A quantitative theory of relevant communication that can be applied to concrete problems with real-world data.

Lior Bracha¹, Gal Chechik^{1,2} ¹Bar-Ilan University, Israel ²Nvidia Research

Measures of Informative Communication

Reduce Uncertainty

The entropy over labels reflects what the listener "doesn't know" about the image. Transmitting a label i reduces the entropy about the remaining labels.

 $\Delta H(i) = H[p(l_1, ..., l_d)] - H[p(l_1, ..., l_d | l_i = true)]$

Entropy reduction favors fine-grained labels (dog over animal). The confidence of the prediction is important.

 $cw - \Delta H(i) = q(l_i|I) \Delta H(i)$

Confidence scores $q(l_i)$ are **calibrated** and reflect the true fraction of correct labels.

Modelling the Distribution Efficiently

Every joint distribution can be written as $p(l_1, \dots, l_d) = p(l_1)p(l_2|l_1) \cdots p(l_d|l_{d-1}, \dots, l_1)$

We approximate it using conditional independence $p(l_1, ..., l_d) \approx p(l_1)p(l_2|l_1) \cdots p(l_d|l_{d-1})$



The entropy factorizes over the tree, and can be computed efficiently

$$H[p(l_1, ..., l_d)] = H\left[\prod_{i=1}^d p(l_i | Pa(l_i))\right] = \sum_{i=1}^d H[p(l_i | Pa(l_i))]$$



Other Measures of Informative Annotations

 Probabilistic surprise: changes to the label distribution $cw - D_{KL}(i) = q(l_i|I) D_{KL}(p(l_1, ..., l_d|l_i)||p(l_1, ..., l_d))$

• Information about images (reference game) cw- $Image\Delta H(i) = q(l_i|I)\log f(l_i)$

• Entropy-of isolated labels (Singleton) $cw-Singleton(i)=q(l_i|I)H(l_i)$

Chow-Liu Tree

The model captures semantic relations from co-occurrence data.

Predefined hierarchical models (WordNet, OID KG) were inferior.



City car O Truck O Bike O Aircraft O Motorcycle Van OCar Vertebrate Y Vehicle Marine biology ^{rer}Dog Wolfdog

Evaluation Protocol

The Data for modelling label distribution: The Open Images Dataset test set: 125K images with 1.5M labels.

Evaluation Ground-truth: New set: 10K images, 3 raters/image.

Metrics: For each image, we rank labels by the above metrics, and compute precision and recall.

	CO	nfidence	ΔH	cw - ΔH
	Animal	1	36.37	36.37
	Small to medium-sized cats	0.8	40.67	32.54
	Pet	1	39.95	39.95
	Whiskers	0.7	40.63	28.44
	Carnivore	0.5	38.95	19.47
	Cat	1	40.24	40.24
	Mammal	1	38.5	38.5







The expected entropy reduction cw- ΔH achieves precision@1 almost as good as inter-rater agreement.

No training data about relevance was used.

Pairwise information is much better that isolated labels (singletons)

Using confidence alone is also highly predictive.

Results



Qualitative Examples			
Confidence $q(l)$	Shoe,	Leaf, plant,	land vehicle
	footwear,	tree, nature,	
	purple	yellow, green	
cw - ΔH	Shoe	Leaf	Car
cw - D_{KL}	Shoe	Autumn	Mercedes-
			benz
cw - $Image\Delta H$	Violet	Season	Mercedes-
			benz
cw- $p(l)$	Purple	Plant	Vehicle
cw- $Singleton$	Purple	Plant	Vehicle