

Dynamic Spatial Verification for Large-Scale Object-Level Image Retrieval

1. Optimizing the NH Score for CPU and GPU computation




Figure 1. A more detailed depiction of the different steps of the OS2OS scoring algorithm. (i.a) Query image Q . (i.b) N Local features with associated geometric data (*i.e.*, coordinates, scale, and rotation) are extracted from the query. (ii) A database containing images $[P_0, P_1, P_2, \dots, P_j]$ is collected. These images may contain donor objects to Q . (iii) Query features are assigned to K nearest database matches in an $N \times K$ match matrix F . (iv) Matches to J unique images are aggregated in sets $M_j, j \in J$. This is done using a parallel bin count. A feature center c_j is estimated for each set of keypoints from a unique database image. (v) Keypoint transformations are calculated relative to the estimated centers. (vi) Keypoint transforms are applied to the database meta-features, projecting them into a voting space. (vii) A Probability Density Function is applied to the voting space to calculate cluster fitness. (viii) As each cluster represents an object, image scores are calculated on an object-by-object basis. Steps (ii) through (vi) are vectorized by reshaping all meta-feature data and match scores to conform to the dimensions of the match matrix F . While slightly more memory intensive, each operation can be performed as either an addition or multiplication on coordinates of the match matrix.

2. Ablation of Parameters

To verify the efficacy of different OS2OS algorithm components, we provide an ablation study on the different parts of the proposed method. We first verify that centroid utilization does in fact contribute to higher retrieval performance. We then iteratively add in the Centrality Score (Eq. 8), then the Angle Score (Eq. 10), then the logarithmic normalization (shown in Eq. 11). These experiments are performed on the Nimble2018 dataset, as to reflect the algorithm’s ability to accurately retrieve donor images when contributing only relatively small amounts of content to a composite query. The study results in Table 1 show that each component provides at least a marginal improvement in retrieval performance, measured as Mean Average Precision (MAP). The results also show the relative stability of results despite changing Hough bin window sizes (WS, Eq. 6). This suggests that as long as window sizes divides the vote space by at least 5, we are able to effectively recover local objects and score them appropriately.

	Pure Hough			+ Centroid (Eq. 2)			CS (Eq. 8)			+ AS (Eq. 10)			+ $\log O $ (Eq. 11)		
w_{sb} (Eq. 7)	5	10	20	5	10	20	5	10	20	5	10	20	5	10	20
R@k=200	76.2	76.3	76.2	77.5	78.1	77.5	80.2	80.9	79.3	81.2	82.1	82.0	83.1	83.2	83.4

Table 1. Ablation study iteratively adding in algorithm components, with voting window sizes (WS) of 5, 10, and 20 for each experiment. Columns 1-3 (Pure Hough) perform simple summed Hough voting (without further scoring) within the given Hough bins.




Figure 2. Comparison of Distribution of L2 distances of Hough vote vectors. When not using centroid calculation (blue), we simply set the vote point to be the center of the query image’s dimensions. Results show that vote distances are significantly shorter when using weighted centroid voting, which helps to reduce the magnification of noisy voting.

2.1. Further study of weighted centroid use

This section aims to show the benefit of using the weighted centroid calculated from matched keypoint locations as the voting center for given images. We perform two matching experiments using a random sample of 5000 images within the Google Landmarks dataset, and extract the average vector length of each vote projection (Eq. 3). Our analysis in Figure 2 shows that utilizing this weighted average.

3. Qualitative Results

Here we provide more visual results of the NH score discovering objects in datasets. We provide visual representations of query cases from all 3 datasets used within the paper, showing success and failure cases for the Nimble, Google, and Reddit datasets. In each figure, the first row corresponds to the highest voted center of points of interest in the query by the points detected in the corresponding rank retrieved image. The second row shows the heatmap of the probability distribution of votes of matched features to the query for the particular image. The third row contains the original rank retrieved image. The columns correspond to the different ranks. Because we use weighted centroid voting, we can visualize where the algorithm matches objects between the query and retrieved images by overlaying the generated Probability Density Function (PDF) of Hough votes on top of each retrieved image.




Figure 3. Results of 3 queries from the Google Landmarks dataset.




Figure 4. A failure scenario from the Google Landmarks dataset where the matches do not appear to be coherent and high affinity matches are false positives.




Figure 5. Example of a query result from the Reddit Provenance Dataset. Incorrect match examples are highlighted in red text. Note the Rank 6 and Rank 8 matches, in which multiple objects from the query are independently donated to the matched result. The heat maps reflect the multiple object matching.




Figure 6. Example of a query result from the Reddit Provenance Dataset. Incorrect match examples are highlighted in red text. Of particular interest is the Rank 5 match, in which the query donates the same object multiple times to the result. The discovery of these 4 donations is reflected in the heat map.



Figure 7. Example of a query result from the Nimble Provenance Dataset. Incorrect match examples are highlighted in red text. In this case, the search algorithm finds both the Man and the puddle as donated objects within the query.



Figure 8. Example of a query result from the Nimble Provenance Dataset. Incorrect match examples are highlighted in red text. The Rank 3 match actually appears within the window frame of the query image.