Tag Prediction at Flickr: A View from the Darkroom

Kofi Boakye Yahoo Research kofi@yahoo-inc.com

Sachin Farfade Yahoo Research fsachin@yahoo-inc.com

Hamid Izadinia University of Washington izadinia@cs.uw.edu

Yannis Kalantidis Facebook skalamas@gmail.com

Pierre Garrigues Yahoo Research garp@yahoo-inc.com

Abstract

Automated photo tagging has established itself as one of the most compelling applications of deep learning. While deep convolutional neural networks have repeatedly demonstrated top performance on standard datasets for classification, there are a number of often overlooked but important considerations when deploying this technology in a real-world scenario. In this paper, we present our efforts in developing a large-scale photo tagging system for Flickr photo search. We discuss topics including how to 1) select the tags that matter most to our users; 2) develop lightweight, high-performance models for tag prediction; and 3) leverage the power of large amounts of noisy data for training. Our results demonstrate that, for real-world datasets, training exclusively with this noisy data yields performance on par with the standard paradigm of first pre-training on clean data and then fine-tuning. In addition, we observe that the models trained with user-generated data can yield better fine-tuning results when a small amount of clean data is available. As such, we advocate for the approach of harnessing usergenerated data in large-scale systems.

1 Introduction

Photos play a central role in our lives. On a daily basis, we pick up our phones, open the camera, and take photos. In turn, searching our personal photos has become one of the most compelling consumer applications of deep learning. Our aim is to develop powerful image recognition models that can be used to power features like search or recommendations in consumer photography products like Flickr.

With deep neural networks being the de facto choice for image classification [\[21\]](#page-11-0), training models with thousands of classes and millions of parameters currently relies on access to large datasets of annotated images, most commonly ImageNet [\[3\]](#page-10-0), a crowdsourced dataset of 14 million images crawled from web search using WordNet [\[24\]](#page-11-1) synsets. ImageNet revolutionized the computer vision and deep learning fields, and still remains the largest public annotated dataset to date. However, such a dataset is not well suited to building models that can be deployed in consumer products such as Flickr. Users' interests span a larger variety of concepts, many of which are not part of ImageNet or even WordNet, while at the same time ImageNet is strongly biased towards photos where a single object appears in the center.

Moreover, given the non-negligible cost and latency, increasing the size of crowdsourced datasets is not easy. On the other end, the Yahoo Flickr Creative Commons 100M (YFCC) dataset [\[34\]](#page-11-2) has a much larger size but only contains user-generated annotations. Though not necessarily accurate, these annotations are numerous and more directly reflect the users' interests.

In this paper, we argue that it is possible to train better models *from scratch*, without any other source of "clean" data. To do so we use the annotations provided by our users via the photo titles, tags, and descriptions. This results in a simpler workflow than the standard paradigm of pre-training on a clean corpus (e.g., ImageNet) and then fine-tuning for the specific classification task [\[6\]](#page-10-1). This is especially the case when developing novel neural network architectures, and we present a fast, lightweight architecture, YFNet, developed with this workflow in mind. We also observe that the YFNet models trained with user-generated content can yield better fine-tuning results when a small amount of clean data is available—an added benefit to utilizing this type of data.

We believe these are important results as deep learning is applied to new domains where large manually labeled datasets may not be available or allowed to be used for commercial purposes. Related to this, we believe it is important to gain insights into the practical impact of label noise. Our main contributions are as follow:

- We show that it is possible to train competitive models without access to "clean", crowdsourced labels and by relying exclusively on user-generated content.
- We propose a low-computation neural network architecture that is suitable for large-scale deployment.
- We present a principled method to select concepts for which to train classifiers.
- We propose a more realistic benchmark for the task of training models from noisy data.
- We propose a method with a human in the loop to calibrate the classifier scores, which is critical when deploying such models in consumer photography products such as Flickr.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section [2](#page-1-0) we discuss related work in large-scale image classification. In Section [3](#page-2-0) we detail our tag selection procedure and introduce the datasets used for model selection and evaluation. We provide a description of the model architecture in Section [4](#page-4-0) and present experimental results in Section [5.](#page-6-0) In Section [6](#page-8-0) we discuss practical considerations related to deployment and we conclude and give future directions in Section [7.](#page-10-2)

2 Related work

With the growing popularity of multimedia sharing apps such as Flickr, Google Photos, and Apple Photos, there has been an increased interest in large-scale image classification and tag prediction. Progress has largely been fueled by ImageNet [\[3\]](#page-10-0), which has provided a public benchmark for training and evaluating deep CNN architectures. Starting with Krizhevsky et al. in [\[21\]](#page-11-0), there has been a significant effort to develop novel architectures that yield increasingly better performance on the ImageNet large-scale classification task [\[29,](#page-11-3) [32,](#page-11-4) [13\]](#page-10-3).

In real-world applications, speed and memory footprint are often important considerations and as a result there has been notable interest in developing powerful yet lightweight CNN architectures. One common approach is to constrain the network to have low-precision or even binary weights, such as in [\[28\]](#page-11-5) or [\[2\]](#page-10-4). Another, adopted in this paper, is to "compress" a larger model to a smaller one using a series of transformations. Iandola et al. in [\[15\]](#page-10-5), for example, employ a series of architectural design strategies (such as filter substitutions) to yield a well-performing CNN with dramatically reduced computational complexity. Similarly, Han et al. in [\[9\]](#page-10-6) reduce the number of parameters in several state-of-the-art neural networks by pruning. He and Sun in [\[10\]](#page-10-7) in turn demonstrate approaches to modify a baseline model while preserving its time complexity, resulting in an architecture 20% faster than AlexNet but with competitive ImageNet accuracy.

The other main challenge of tag prediction in the wild is the large amount of noise present in user annotations, which has been addressed in varying ways. One is to explicitly model the noise, as done in [\[25,](#page-11-6) [30,](#page-11-7) [17,](#page-11-8) [39\]](#page-11-9). Typically the label noise is modeled as a simple flip or swap. In contrast, in [\[25\]](#page-11-6) and [\[17\]](#page-11-8), the authors model noise from missing, but visually present labels by introducing a latent variable to capture labeled concepts separate from present ones. Veit et al. in [\[35\]](#page-11-10) learn a more complex noise model by training a parallel "label cleaning network" that leverages examples with both noisy labels and human verified ones. Rather than use an explicit noise model, Denton et al. in [\[4\]](#page-10-8) use the WARP loss [\[37\]](#page-11-11) to produce a set of embedding models for tag prediction. They are also able to show improved results by incorporating user metadata into the embedding process. Wu et al.

in [\[38\]](#page-11-12) use a similar pairwise ranking loss to handle weakly labeled images and a triplet similarity loss for unlabeled images. And most similar to our work, Joulin et al. in [\[18\]](#page-11-13) train models on a large collection of images and their associated titles and captions. The authors use the penultimate layer of their models as a feature representation that yields competitive results on a number of tasks. Beyond leading to powerful image representations, we show in this paper that the user annotations can be used to train large-scale image classifiers that are useful in practical consumer photography applications.

3 Datasets & tag selection

3.1 Datasets

At the heart of the success of deep neural networks for image classification is the availability of large datasets of annotated photos such as the ImageNet corpus [\[3\]](#page-10-0). Indeed, progress in deep learning and image recognition has been primarily driven by performance on the ImageNet benchmark. In recent years, performance on this benchmark has arguably matched that of humans [\[12\]](#page-10-9), leading to the perception of image recognition as a solved problem. However, ImageNet was created using web search queries and mostly features iconic images for each class. Hence, it does not adequately capture the domain of consumer photos where the composition is typically more complex with multiple objects appearing jointly. In addition, the list of classes was picked from the WordNet hierarchy [\[24\]](#page-11-1) and does not necessarily reflect what people care to find in their photos. As such, models performing well on ImageNet cannot be applied directly to consumer photography problems such as search or assisted tagging.

In contrast, datasets such as NUS-WIDE [\[1\]](#page-10-10), COCO [\[22\]](#page-11-14), Visual Genome (VG) [\[20\]](#page-11-15), and Open Images [\[19\]](#page-11-16) are primarily crawled from Flickr and are therefore well adapted to the consumer photography domain. NUS-WIDE is a common benchmark for multi-label classification systems as images typically contain multiple tags [\[8\]](#page-10-11). COCO additionally provides location information of the objects pictured and serves as a popular benchmark for object detection [\[7\]](#page-10-12) and segmentation systems [\[27\]](#page-11-17). The more recent VG contains richer annotations such as object relationships. The largest of these datasets, Open Images, contains [∼]9M Flickr Creative Commons images with the majority of labels provided by a pre-trained Inception-v3 model [\[33\]](#page-11-18). One undesirable effect of this labeling approach is that models trained on this dataset have a dependency on the training dataset for the Inception-v3 "labeler", which is not known. Of the datasets most related to our desired usecase, COCO and NUS-WIDE are rather small both in terms of number of images (a few hundred thousand) and number of tags (around a hundred). State-of-the art performance on these datasets is obtained by fine-tuning a deep neural network that was pre-trained on ImageNet. Hence, good performance relies on access to a larger labeled dataset. More importantly, the list of concepts in these datasets is ad-hoc and a small subset of what people are interested in identifying in their photos.

As such, we argue that the dataset best suited for training models designed with consumer photography applications in mind is the Yahoo Flickr Creative Commons 100M Dataset [\[34\]](#page-11-2) (YFCC) dataset. It is one of the largest public multimedia datasets ever released, has statistics that are similar to general Flickr photos, and can be used for research. Annotations are provided by Flickr users in the form of photo titles, tags, and descriptions. Although there is a significant amount of noise in this data, the annotations are extensive and cover thousands of concepts. Recent work has shown that YFCC can be used to train image classifiers using a model pre-trained on ImageNet [\[17\]](#page-11-8), as well as to develop a powerful image representation without access to any additional source of accurately annotated data [\[18\]](#page-11-13). In this paper we combine these two contributions and show that we can train powerful image classifiers from the noisy annotations directly. Moreover, COCO and VG are built using Flickr Creative Commons photos and have a large overlap with YFCC. Hence, we can use COCO and VG as test sets to accurately measure the performance of our classifiers. We can also measure the impact of training with noisy annotations by comparing with models that have been trained on COCO and VG. See Section [5](#page-6-0) for a discussion of the results.

Table [1](#page-3-0) presents example images for five tags from the four datasets considered in this work: ImageNet, YFCC, VG, and COCO. From the examples we do see that ImageNet concepts tend to be larger and centrally biased within the images. The size and location of concepts in the other datasets can vary significantly, for example in the case of the COCO "cup" and VG "mouse" images, re-

spectively. The noise in the YFCC annotations is also evident, as shown it its "cup" and "mouse" examples.

Table 1: Example images for select tags from the four experimental datasets. ImageNet concepts display a strong central bias when compared to the other datasets. The noise in the user annotation for YFCC is also apparent.

3.2 Tag selection

In order to determine which tags our models ought to predict, we need to understand what users are interested in searching or tagging in their photos. The standard paradigm in web search is to leverage click logs to determine the most important queries. We argue that such data is currently of limited value for personal search. Indeed, the ability to search one's photos using computer vision has only recently been implemented in consumer products such as Flickr, Google Photos, or Apple Photos, and awareness of the feature remains limited.

We propose to use Flickr tags as a proxy for personal photo search query logs. By making the assumption that a user tags a photo in order to have the ability for her and others to retrieve it at a later time using search, we can think of a *(photo, tag)* pair as a *(query, click)* pair. Hence we can leverage hundreds of millions of tags Flickr users have created over the last decade. We use YFCC to determine the list of top tags for which we will train classifiers. We use Creative Commons photos as their statistics are similar to general Flickr photos and they can easily be used for research.

Table [2](#page-4-1) shows the tags that appear in most photos as well as the tags that have been used by the most users. We observe that the tags that appear in the most photos (Table [2a\)](#page-4-1) are not necessarily relevant to train image classifiers. This is in part an artifact of third-party applications uploading to Flickr—such as Instagram—that apply the tags "square" or "iphoneography" to every photo. Other frequent tags such as "2010" can be easily obtained using photo EXIF data. When ranking using the number of users who have used the tag at least once (Table [2b\)](#page-4-1), the top tags are more relevant. As such, we manually reviewed the top 10,000 tags and excluded tags in the following categories: Numbers: A tag such as "2014" can easily be recovered using the photo EXIF data.

Location: Most photos nowadays are taken using mobile phone cameras and have GPS information available. Although it is an interesting and active research problem to determine the location of a photo given only the pixels [\[40,](#page-11-19) [5\]](#page-10-13), we believe location is better addressed in the context of also having geo information available and is beyond the scope of this paper.

Non-english: We do not want to train redundant classifiers for "dog" and "chien". We think it is preferable to address internationalization as a separate system where a query in a different language can be mapped to our existing set of classifiers.

"Sensitive" tags: Certain tags have a highly asymmetric miss/false-alarm cost for users (e.g., "old" or "fat") and a set of these tags was manually identified and excluded.

Our final concept vocabulary contains 4,562 tags and is found in the appendix.

Table 2: YFCC tag statistics.

4 Model architecture

Though the trend in the computer vision community has been to use deeper and more complex models to improve performance on ImageNet [\[29,](#page-11-3) [32,](#page-11-4) [14\]](#page-10-14), computational complexity and model size often make these models impractical for industrial applications. Hence we propose an architecture that is computationally much cheaper at inference time (less than 900M multiply-adds) than state-of-the-art models while remaining competitive on the ImageNet benchmark. Although we are ultimately interested in optimizing performance in the consumer photography domain, we use ImageNet when searching for low-complexity architectures. The large body of work on this dataset makes it easier to understand the impact of our design choices and benchmark our results against well-known architectures.

4.1 Constrained Time Cost (CTC) model

We draw inspiration from the layer replacement strategy used by He and Sun in [\[10\]](#page-10-7). The authors start with an initial architecture that is similar to AlexNet [\[21\]](#page-11-0) with two differences: 1) they use a spatial pyramid pooling (SPP) layer [\[11\]](#page-10-15) after the last convolutional layer instead of max pooling; and 2) the filter size for the first convolutional layer is 7×7 instead of 11×11 . By substituting layers with large filters (e.g., 5×5) with a cascade of layers with smaller filters (e.g., 3×3) performance improves while preserving the computational complexity. Our resulting architectures are presented in Table [3.](#page-5-0)

4.2 Deeper YFNet model

In an effort to improve upon the CTC models, we started with a deeper initial model, dubbed "YFNet" (Yahoo-Flickr Network). As larger filters (e.g., 5×5) can be replaced with a cascade of smaller filters [\[10,](#page-10-7) [33\]](#page-11-18), our initial model, YFNet-A, consists solely of 3×3 convolutions other than the 7×7 convolution in the first layer. For YFNet-A we replaced a 5×5 convolutional layer in CTC-A with two 3×3 layers in Stage-2 and also added three 3×3 layers in Stage-4. Details of the model are provided in Table [3.](#page-5-0) Adding a fourth stage makes YFNet-A computationally more expensive (1117M operations) compared to the baseline CTC-J model (901M operations).

Name	Stage-1 Stage-2		Stage-3	Stage-4	
CTC-A	$\frac{(7,64)}{2+3/3}$	$(5, 128)+2/2$	$(3, 256) \times 3$		
CTC-J	$(7,64)/_{2}+3/_{3}$	$(2, 128) \times 4 + 2/2$	$(2,256)\times4+3/3$	$(2, 2304) + (2, 256)$	
YFNet-A	$(7,64)/_{2}+3/_{3}$	$(3, 128) \times 2 + 2/2$	$(3,256)\times3+3/3$	$(3,512)\times2+(3,256)$	
YFNet-B	$(7,64)/_{2}+3/_{3}$	$(1\times3+3\times1, 128)\times2+2/2$	$(3,256)\times3+3/3$	$(3,512)\times2+(3,256)$	
YFNet-C	$\frac{(7,64)}{2+3/3}$	$(1\times3+3\times1, 128)\times2+2/2$	$(1\times3+3\times1,256)\times3+3/3$	$(3,512)\times2+(3,256)$	
			$(1\times3+3\times1,256)\times3+3/3$	$(1\times3+3\times1, 512)\times2$	
	YFNet-D $(7, 64)/_2 + 3/_3$	$(1\times3+3\times1, 128)\times2+2/2$		$+(1\times3+3\times1,256)$	

Table 3: Configurations of the CTC and YFNet models. The notation (s, n) represents the filter size and the number of filters. "/₂" represents stride = 2 (default 1). " $\times k$ " means the same layer configuration is applied k times (not sharing weights). "+" means another layer is followed. The "+ m/m " notation refers to a pooling layer. All convolutional layers are with batchnorm and ReLU. The feature map sizes of stages 2, 3, and 4 are 36×36 , 18×18 , and 6×6 , respectively.

Name	$Top-1$	#Ops(M)	$\#$ Params (M)
VGG16	0.684	15470	138
InceptionResNet-v2	0.804	13000	51
Inception-v3	0.780	4800	25
AlexNet	0.571	1135	62
YFNet-A	0.632	1117	80
YFNet-B	0.649	1068	78
YFNet-C	0.658	940	78
CTC-A	0.568	926	75
CTC-J	0.635	901	79
YFNet-D	0.664	877	78

Table 4: Comparison with well-known models on ImageNet ordered by number of multiply-add operations. Top-1 accuracy is measured on the validation set using single center crop. Numbers of operations and parameters are in millions.

To compensate for this added complexity we factored 3×3 filters into a 3×1 convolution followed by a 1×3 convolution as in [\[33\]](#page-11-18). This reduces complexity by 33% while substituting with two 2×2 convolution layers only saves 11%. Interestingly, this approach also improved performance as shown with models YFNet-B, C and D in Table [4.](#page-5-1) Compared to CTC-J, YFNet-D is deeper and computationally less complex (877M vs 901M operations) while still achieving [∼]3% higher top-1 accuracy on ImageNet.

In Table [4](#page-5-1) we compare the performance of our models with other state-of-the-art architectures. We see that YFNet-D significantly outperforms AlexNet for approximately the same computational cost. Although top-1 accuracy is lower than Inception-v3 [\[33\]](#page-11-18) and InceptionResNet-v2 [\[31\]](#page-11-20), our model is [∼]5.5x and [∼]14.8x faster, respectively, in terms of operations.

Figure 1: The Yahoo-Flickr Network (YFNet) architecture. YFNet-D pictured.

4.3 Training methodology

We used the open-source TensorFlowOnSpark infrastructure^{[1](#page-6-1)} for training/testing our models. In our experiments we used one executor with all 8 GPUs to train a model while training multiple models in parallel on different executors.

Data Augmentation: For training and testing, a 221x221 image was randomly cropped from a rescaled 256x256 image. During training, 10 views were cropped from the center, the four corners, and their flipped versions. For testing only the center crop was used.

Settings: Unless otherwise stated, we used a mini-batch size of 256 and started with a learning rate of 0.01 which we decreased by a factor of 10 every 20 epochs. We trained the network for 90 epochs. The weight decay was set to 0.0005 and momentum 0.9. We added a batch normalization layer [\[16\]](#page-10-16) after each convolutional and fully-connected layer and used dropout in fully-connected layers with dropout ratio of 0.2. The spatial pyramid pooling (SPP) connected to the last convolutional layer has 4 levels: 6×6 , 3×3 , 2×2 , and 1×1 , totaling 50 bins. The four levels are concatenated before feeding to the fully-connected layer.

5 Results

5.1 YFCC tag prediction

As mentioned in Section [2,](#page-1-0) there are many recent works that have dealt with training from noisy labels. These efforts, however, usually model label noise unrealistically, e.g., through simple label flips or the existence of outlier images. In our own analyses, we have observed that the most common source of noise in user-generated data is, in fact, missing labels. For our YFCC models, we simply trained using a randomized softmax that has been shown to perform well for multilabel classification [\[18\]](#page-11-13). That is, for a given training image, we randomly selected a single target tag from among the set of positive tags. As the average number of tags per image in this dataset (∼1.07 tags/image) is small relative to the total number of tags, the effect of this randomization was anticipated to be negligible.

In order to study the impact of dataset size, we generated datasets with $k \in \{1000, 2000, 4000\}$ samples per tag. The k samples per tag were selected by taking the top scoring photos using a linear combination of the *tf-idf* matches between the tag and the photo's title, description, and tags. Images belonging to COCO or VG were excluded.

We evaluated our models on two manually annotated data-sets: COCO and VG. We used the COCO validation set for testing, which contains 80 concepts, 67 of which overlap with our selected concepts from YFCC. In the case of VG, we used a subset of the overall corpus obtained by first selecting as concepts all *objects* that appear more than 80 times and cover more than 2.5% area in the image. This resulted in 1432 concepts, 903 of which overlap with our YFCC ones. The images associated with

¹[https://yahooeng.tumblr.com/post/157196488076/open-sourcing-\](https://yahooeng.tumblr.com/post/157196488076/open-sourcing-\tensorflowonspark-distributed-deep) [tensorflowonspark-distributed-deep](https://yahooeng.tumblr.com/post/157196488076/open-sourcing-\tensorflowonspark-distributed-deep)

these concepts are then partitioned into a training set for fine-tuning experiments and a validation set for testing. The training set consists of ∼88k images and the validation set ∼17k images. We note that the 903 concepts on which we report results in this paper could further be increased by a few hundred concepts if *attributes* are considered in addition to objects. Although this is a fraction of the tags we actually predict, it does give us the ability to report more accurate results.

In Table [5](#page-7-0) we show the COCO and VG mean average precision (mAP) scores for models pre-trained on ImageNet and trained from scratch on YFCC data. For YFCC models pre-trained on ImageNet, training started with a learning rate of 0.001 and decreased by a factor of 10 every 10 epochs. When training from scratch with YFCC data, we started with a learning rate of 0.01 and also decreased it by factor of 10 every 10 epochs. The pre-trained and randomly-initialized models were trained for a total of 25 and 35 epochs, respectively. The table headings "COCO67" and "VG903" reflect the 67 and 903 tag overlap between YFCC and the two respective evaluation datasets. We observe that, as with the ImageNet dataset, YFNet-D significantly outperforms CTC-J, with a 13% minimum relative improvement for COCO and a 26% minimum relative improvement for VG. Regarding the notable difference in mAP scores between COCO and VG, we have observed that many images in VG are not exhaustively labeled which has in part contributed to the lower scores on that dataset. As expected, performance improves with the number of training examples, further validating the importance of data in training deep neural networks. More interestingly, the performance is similar for a model trained from a random initialization and a model pre-trained on ImageNet. This is particularly true for the larger training datasets and demonstrates that it is indeed possible to train competitive image recognition models without access to "clean", crowdsourced data.

Name	Dataset		Performance (mAP)		
	Pre-train Train		COCO ₆₇	VG903	
CTC-J	ILSVRC-1K	YFCC-1K	0.374	0.082	
YFNet-D	ILSVRC-1K	YFCC-1K	0.437	0.109	
YFNet-D	ILSVRC-1K	YFCC-2K	0.456	0.115	
YFNet-D	ILSVRC-1K	YFCC-4K	0.461	0.118	
YFNet-D		YFCC-1K	0.422	0.103	
YFNet-D		YFCC-2K	0.448	0.114	
YFNet-D		YFCC-4K	0.459	0.118	

Table 5: Results on COCO67 and VG903 datasets. We used 25 epochs for fine-tuning and 35 epochs for training from scatch.

5.2 COCO and VG tag prediction

In addition to assessing the performance of our YFCC model for tag prediction on its own, we investigated its ability to serve as a pre-trained model when a small amount of clean data is available for fine-tuning. Table [6](#page-8-1) presents results for COCO data and Table [7](#page-8-2) presents results for VG. We adopt the same convention where the number following the dataset abbreviation refers to the number of tags under evaluation. For these fine-tuning experiments we used a learning rate of 0.1 and trained on COCO and VG for 70 and 60 epochs, respectively.

For COCO, the ImageNet and YFCC pre-trained models achieve parity performance when the latter is trained with 2,000 examples per tag. For VG, it is the model pre-trained with 1,000 YFCC examples per tag that yields performance on par with the ImageNet pre-trained model. Furthermore, as we increase the amount of training data, these YFCC pre-trained models outperform the ImageNet one. In particular, the YFNet-D model pre-trained with the YFCC-4K data yields a 5% relative improvement for the full VG dataset and 6.5% relative improvement for the 903 tag overlap with our YFCC tags. For COCO the improvement when using the YFCC-4K data is not as evident, which may be due to the many fewer tags in that corpus. Table [8](#page-9-0) presents example top-5 predictions for the best-performing YFNet-D models on COCO and VG, respectively.

Our observations are similar to the transfer learning results in [\[18\]](#page-11-13). The authors show on the Pascal VOC benchmark that fine-tuning from YFCC improves performance over models that were pretrained on ImageNet for the AlexNet architecture. However they find the opposite for the GoogleNet architecture. For both COCO and VG we also examined the performance of the Inception-v2 and

Inception-ResNet-v2 for comparison. In both cases the relative performance exhibits a trend similar to when training on ImageNet (see Table [4\)](#page-5-1). For computational reasons we have not at this time trained the Inception-v2 and Inception-ResNet-v2 architectures on the YFCC-4K dataset from scratch. Hence, we do not report results comparing performance for these models when pre-trained on the YFCC data.

We observe a significant performance gain when we have access to clean data to train the classifiers. The performance on COCO67 increases from 0.459 to 0.637 on COCO67 when using COCO data for fine-tuning, and from 0.118 to 0.181 on VG903 when using VG data for fine-tuning. We believe that our proposed task—i.e., using YFCC exclusively for training and measuring performance on COCO and VG—is particularly relevant for researchers interested in leveraging noisy labels. There is a significant performance gap that remains to be closed. In addition, this task is more realistic than existing approaches where noisy datasets are created by randomly flipping labels.

The results show that the weakly-supervised YFCC data can be effectively leveraged to train largescale image classification models. We obtain our best results when we use the YFCC data for pre-training, and the clean labels for fine-tuning. Hence, as deep learning is applied in new areas, this suggests a new paradigm of first harnessing all sources of labels, even if they are noisy, before assembling a large crowdsourced dataset with clean labels.

Name	Pre-train Dataset	Performance (mAP)		
		VG903	VG1432	
YFNet-D	ILSVRC-1K	0.170	0.144	
YFNet-D	YFCC-1K	0.169	0.141	
YFNet-D	YFCC-2K	0.174	0.147	
YFNet-D	YFCC-4K	0.181	0.151	
Inception-v3	ILSVRC-1K	0.206	0.173	
Inception-ResNet-v2	ILSVRC-1K	0.219	0.185	

Table 6: Fine-tuning results on COCO dataset. We used 70 epochs for fine-tuning.

Table 7: Fine-tuning results on VG datasets. We used 60 epochs for fine-tuning.

6 Deployment

The primary goal when developing our classifiers is to improve features in products such as Flickr search or photo recommendations. It is critical to have a separation of concerns between the core recognition technology and downstream applications. Otherwise, spurious dependencies make these systems harder to maintain, create technical debt, and ultimately slow down innovation. In order to achieve such a separation, the classifiers' output scores ought to be:

• Interpretable: An application developer needs to achieve the correct operating point in the precision/recall trade-off in order to achieve product requirements. For example, recall may be more important than precision for personal photo search. The most natural output score is the posterior probability of a tag being present in an image, e.g. $p(dog|image)$. Also, having an interpretable representation makes it possible to deactivate a classifier in the event of unacceptable edge-cases.

Images and Predictions							
COCO		kite, person, back- pack, hand- bag, boat		baseball glove, baseball bat, sports ball, chair		tie, person, cell phone, couch, cup	
		dining table, broccoli, bowl, spoon, person		bicycle, person, motor- cycle, hand- bag, umbrella		bed, cat, couch, dog, book	
Visual Genome	THE ELECTION	water, tree, bicycle, grass, fence		fork, plate, glass, table, knife		sheep, grass, man, woman, field	
		sky, cloud, horse, grass, man		kite, sky, hill, grass, cloud		girl, table, plate, shirt, child	

Table 8: Example top-5 predictions for select images from the COCO and VG validation dataset. Incorrect predictions are in red.

- Consistent across tags: A score of 0.8 for the "cat" classifier should have the same meaning as a score of 0.8 for the "flower" classifier. By using the posterior probability as the classifier's output for each tag, we ensure consistency in the interpretation of the scores.
- Consistent across versions: Image recognition is evolving fast and we need the ability to release improved versions of our system without having to modify downstream components. For example, if classifier scores in a new version had a different dynamic range, additional logic would be required in order to jointly rank photos tagged by different versions and would increase technical debt.

To address this, we transform the pre-softmax activations into a posterior probability by using a sigmoid function where we estimate a bias term for each class.

$$
p(c_i|x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-s_i(x) - b_i)}
$$
(1)

It is unfortunately difficult to estimate this bias as we are in a Positive/Unlabeled (P/U) setting [\[26\]](#page-11-21). In practice, photos from YFCC are not exhaustively labeled and therefore many negative examples for a given tag may in fact be positive. It has been shown that it is not possible to accurately estimate the posterior probability unless the empirical distribution of the class is known [\[36\]](#page-11-22).

In order to understand how our image classifiers will perform "in the wild", we apply our classifiers to 100,000 photos sampled at random from YFCC that are not in the training set. We built a simple web app to visualize the-top scoring photos for each classifier. This makes it possible to determine whether the classifier is able to extract relevant photos. Using the web application we can also manually set the bias term b_i in order to approximate the posterior probability. To do this, we visualize images with posterior probability around 0.9 and adjust the bias until we observe that 9 out of 10 are correct. Though this process is cumbersome and error-prone, when deploying these algorithms in our products, we think that manual calibration remains critical and further automation of this calibration step is an area of ongoing research.

7 Conclusion & future directions

In this paper we aimed to shed light on the process of developing a large-scale, state-of-the-art tagging system for photo search. We have identified and discussed the most relevant engineering challenges including tag selection, training dataset creation, as well as development, training, and calibration of the classification model. In addition, we have developed novel architectures that perform well in the consumer photo domain, where the scale of the data and noisiness of the annotations present significant challenges. Using only noisy user-generated annotations and our YFNet architecture, we are able to train a model that achieves tag prediction performance competitive with a model pre-trained on ImageNet data. With the growing number of photos being uploaded, we believe that training with noisy labels from corpora like YFCC is an important problem for large-scale image classification and is highly applicable in many commercial domains. Moreover, we believe that training models on YFCC and testing on Visual Genome is a good benchmark for research in this area. For Visual Genome, we are currently expanding test classes to include not just entities but also attributes and relationships. We are also exploring more expressive loss functions with an explicit noise model, and on the model architecture side, fully-convolutional networks [\[23\]](#page-11-23) which offer the promise of being better able to recognize small but relevant visual concepts within a photo.

References

- [1] T.-S. Chua, J. Tang, R. Hong, H. Li, Z. Luo, and Y. Zheng. Nus-wide: a real-world web image database from national university of singapore. In *CIVR*, 2009.
- [2] M. Courbariaux, Y. Bengio, and J.-P. David. Binaryconnect: Training deep neural networks with binary weights during propagations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3123–3131, 2015.
- [3] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009.
- [4] E. Denton, J. Weston, M. Paluri, L. Bourdev, and R. Fergus. User conditional hashtag prediction for images. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1731–1740. ACM, 2015.
- [5] C. Doersch, S. Singh, A. Gupta, J. Sivic, and A. Efros. What makes paris look like paris? *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 31(4), 2012.
- [6] J. Donahue, Y. Jia, O. Vinyals, J. Hoffman, N. Zhang, E. Tzeng, and T. Darrell. Decaf: A deep convolutional activation feature for generic visual recognition. In *Icml*, volume 32, pages 647–655, 2014.
- [7] R. Girshick. Fast r-cnn. In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.
- [8] Y. Gong, Y. Jia, T. Leung, A. Toshev, and S. Ioffe. Deep convolutional ranking for multilabel image annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4894*, 2013.
- [9] S. Han, J. Pool, J. Tran, and W. Dally. Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1135–1143, 2015.
- [10] K. He and J. Sun. Convolutional neural networks at constrained time cost. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [11] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Spatial pyramid pooling in deep convolutional networks for visual recognition. In *ECCV*, 2014.
- [12] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1026–1034, 2015.
- [13] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [14] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [15] F. N. Iandola, M. W. Moskewicz, K. Ashraf, S. Han, W. J. Dally, and K. Keutzer. Squeezenet: Alexnet-level accuracy with 50x fewer parameters and <1mb model size. *arXiv:1602.07360*, 2016.
- [16] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03167*, 2015.
- [17] H. Izadinia, B. C. Russell, A. Farhadi, M. D. Hoffman, and A. Hertzmann. Deep classifiers from image tags in the wild. In *MMCommons*, 2015.
- [18] A. Joulin, L. van der Maaten, A. Jabri, and N. Vasilache. Learning visual features from large weakly supervised data. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 67–84. Springer, 2016.
- [19] I. Krasin, T. Duerig, N. Alldrin, A. Veit, S. Abu-El-Haija, S. Belongie, D. Cai, Z. Feng, V. Ferrari, V. Gomes, et al. Openimages: A public dataset for large-scale multi-label and multiclass image classification. *Dataset available from https://github. com/openimages*, 2(6):7, 2016.
- [20] R. Krishna, Y. Zhu, O. Groth, J. Johnson, K. Hata, J. Kravitz, S. Chen, Y. Kalantidis, L.-J. Li, D. A. Shamma, et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.07332*, 2016.
- [21] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *NIPS*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.
- [22] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollar, and C. L. Zitnick. ´ Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, pages 740–755, 2014.
- [23] J. Long, E. Shelhamer, and T. Darrell. Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation. In *CVPR*, pages 3431–3440, 2015.
- [24] G. A. Miller. Wordnet: a lexical database for english. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39– 41, 1995.
- [25] I. Misra, C. L. Zitnick, M. Mitchell, and R. Girshick. Seeing through the human reporting bias: Visual classifiers from noisy human-centric labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.0697*, 2016.
- [26] K. Nigam, A. K. McCallum, S. Thrun, and T. Mitchell. Text classification from labeled and unlabeled documents using em. *Machine learning*, 39(2-3):103–134, 2000.
- [27] P. O. Pinheiro, R. Collobert, and P. Dollar. Learning to segment object candidates. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1990–1998, 2015.
- [28] M. Rastegari, V. Ordonez, J. Redmon, and A. Farhadi. Xnor-net: Imagenet classification using binary convolutional neural networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 525–542. Springer, 2016.
- [29] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [30] S. Sukhbaatar, J. Bruna, M. Paluri, L. Bourdev, and R. Fergus. Training convolutional networks with noisy labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.2080*, 2014.
- [31] C. Szegedy, S. Ioffe, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.07261*, 2016.
- [32] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [33] C. Szegedy, V. Vanhoucke, S. Ioffe, J. Shlens, and Z. Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. *CoRR*, abs/1512.00567, 2015.
- [34] B. Thomee, D. A. Shamma, G. Friedland, B. Elizalde, K. Ni, D. Poland, D. Borth, and L.-J. Li. YFCC100M: The new data in multimedia research. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(2):64–73, 2016.
- [35] A. Veit, N. Alldrin, G. Chechik, I. Krasin, A. Gupta, and S. Belongie. Learning from noisy large-scale datasets with minimal supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.01619*, 2017.
- [36] G. Ward, T. Hastie, S. Barry, J. Elith, and J. R. Leathwick. Presence-only data and the em algorithm. *Biometrics*, 65(2):554–563, 2009.
- [37] J. Weston, S. Bengio, and N. Usunier. Wsabie: Scaling up to large vocabulary image annotation. In *IJCAI*, volume 11, pages 2764–2770, 2011.
- [38] F. Wu, Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, Y. Yang, J. Luo, W. Zhu, and Y. Zhuang. Weakly semi-supervised deep learning for multi-label image annotation. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 1(3):109–122, 2015.
- [39] T. Xiao, T. Xia, Y. Yang, C. Huang, and X. Wang. Learning from massive noisy labeled data for image classification. In *CVPR*, 2015.
- [40] Y.-T. Zheng, M. Zhao, Y. Song, H. Adam, U. Buddemeier, A. Bissacco, F. Brucher, T.-S. Chua, and H. Neven. Tour the world: building a web-scale landmark recognition engine. In *Computer vision and pattern recognition, 2009. CVPR 2009. IEEE conference on*, pages 1085–1092. IEEE, 2009.

A Appendix

List of all 4562 Flickr tags.

