Overview of the detection challenge

Presented by Yu-Gang Jiang (Fudan University)
Zurich, Switzerland, Sept. 7th 2014
The THUMOS’13 Localization Challenge Dataset

- 24 action classes from UCF101; 3207 clips in total
- 3 training/test splits
  - 18 out of 25 groups for training, 7 for testing
- Selected 10 classes from UCF11 (a part of UCF101 that has local bbx annotations), annotated 14 more classes (1818 clips)
  - Hired 8 people; each spent ~40 hours

Example Videos of THUMOS’13

• BasketballShooting

• BasketballDunk
The number of localization submissions we received in 2013: 0
The number of submissions we received in 2014:
11 runs from 3 teams!!!
Changes in 2014

• Switched from spatial-temporal localization to temporal localization.
  – Temporal boundaries are more important
  – Lower computational complexity
  – Annotation is cheaper

• Adopted temporally untrimmed videos for validation and testing; UCF101 was still used, for training only.
Number of Clips Per Class (Train & Validation)
Clip Duration Per Class (Train & Validation)
Action Duration (%) Per Class (Validation)
Annotation Tool

http://viper-toolkit.sourceforge.net/
Annotation Tool

- Mostly annotated by one person, who did two passes.
  - Additional checks made by at least two other people.
- An action interval was annotated as Ambiguous in several cases including heavy temporal or spatial crops (below), graphics animations, etc.
Evaluation Measure

• The traditional “intersection-over-union” criterion
  – A detection is correct if the predicted class label is correct and the overlapping criterion is larger a threshold (0.5)

• AP / mAP
Results
Overall (mAP)
INRIA-LEAR achieved top results for 18 classes; CUHK-SIAT and UNIFI one class each
Overall (mAP) after excluding background videos or videos of the other classes
AP vs. # positive instances (INRIA R3)
Approaches
CUHK-SIAT

• Feature:
  – FV encoding of IDT features
  – CNN features
  – Early fusion (?)

• Classifier:
  – 1-vs-rest (Linear?) SVM over temporal windows
  – fixed sliding window size (150 frames)
  – step size (100 frames)

• Post-processing:
  – Thresholds on both video and temporal clip window levels.
INRIA-LEAR

• Feature:
  – FV encoding of IDT features

• Classifier:
  – 1-vs-rest (linear?) SVM over temporal windows, with hard negative mining
  – sliding window size: 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, and 150 frames.
  – Step size: 10 frames

• Rescore by:
  – Detection window size
  – Class-specific duration prior estimated from training data

• Context:
  – Combining window’s detection score with video’s classification score for the same action class
  – Classification used additional features: SIFT (FV), Color Moments, CNN, MFCC (FV), ASR
UNIFI

• Features:
  – FV encoding of IDT features (weighted based on saliency predicted by BING Objectness)
  – CNN features using Decaf
  – Late Fusion

• Classifier:
  – 1-vs-rest linear SVM over temporal windows
  – sliding window size: 200 frames.
  – Step size: 100 frames
  – Combined with classification score (similar to INRIA-LEAR)
Summary

• Common techniques:
  – Features:
    • FV encoding of IDT feature
    • CNN feature
  – Classifier:
    • 1-vs-rest SVM over temporal windows

• Differences:
  • Early or late fusion
  • Window size, step size, hard negatives
  • Post-processing (rescoring, thresholding)
  • Combination with classification scores (context)
Per-class (AP)
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Thank you!
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