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Abstract—Image retagging aims to improve tag quality of social images by refining their original tags or assigning new high-quality tags. Recent approaches simultaneously explore visual, user and tag information to improve the performance of image retagging by constructing and exploring an image-tag-user graph. However, such methods will become computationally infeasible with the rapidly increasing number of images, tags and users. It has been proven that Anchor Graph Regularization (AGR) can significantly accelerate large-scale graph learning model by exploring only a small number of anchor points. Inspired by this, we propose a novel Social anchor-Unit GrAph Regularized Tensor Completion (SUGAR-TC) method to effectively refine the tags of social images, which is insensitive to the scale of the applied data. First, we construct an anchor-unit graph across multiple domains (e.g., image and user domains) rather than traditional anchor graph in a single domain. Second, a tensor completion based on SUGAR is implemented on the original image-tag-user tensor to refine the tags of the anchor images. Third, we efficiently assign tags to non-anchor images by leveraging the relationship between the non-anchor images and the anchor units. Experimental results on a real-world social image database well demonstrate the effectiveness of SUGAR-TC, outperforming several related methods.

Index Terms—Image retagging, graph learning, tensor completion, image retrieval.

1 INTRODUCTION

On social websites, users can upload images, label them with freely-chosen tags, and join user groups with common interests. Since users have various backgrounds and interests, the user-provided tags tend to be ambiguous, noisy and incomplete. This significantly limits the performance of the tag-based social image retrieval [1]. Therefore, how to automatically refine the original tags and rectify the noise-corrupted ones becomes an essential step in the task of tag-based social image retrieval.

In the past two decades, various social image retagging methods [3], [4], [5], [6] have been proposed to improve the quality of tags of social images. At the early stage, image retagging methods assign tags to social images by utilizing semantic correlation among tags and visual similarity among images [7], [8]. A basic assumption of such methods is that two images with high visual similarity should have similar semantic tags, and vice versa. However, it neglects the inter-association information between images and tags. Subsequently, to leverage this available image-tag inter-association, some researchers improved the matrix completion based on low-rank approximation to simultaneously recover the missing tags, and remove the noisy tags. Here, Candès et al. [9] have proven that the matrix completion model has an ability to complete the missing entries from a small number of observed entries in the original matrix between the dyadic data. However, the aforementioned methods achieve unsatisfactory retagging results when visual content and label taxonomy (e.g., WordNet taxonomy) are inconsistent with each other.

Intuitively, on social websites, a set of images uploaded
We formulate a tensor completion module. (a) Social anchor-unit graph: obtain anchor units and construct anchor-unit graph with the inter- and intra-adjacency edges. (b) SUGAR tensor completion: refine tags of anchor images. (c) Anchor-aware tag assignment: assign tags to non-anchor images via the inter association between non-anchor data and anchor units.

by one common user tends to have close relations. That is to say, the user information (e.g., user interests and backgrounds) bridges the inter-relationship between tags and social images [10], especially for some certain tags [11], e.g., geo-related tags, event tags, etc. Therefore, some methods are proposed to simultaneously leverage the visual information, tag information, and user information for social image retagging. Motivated by matrix completion model, Sang et al. [5] attempted to model the inter-relationships among users, images and tags, and formulated a tensor completion based on a low-rank approximation to assign images with better tags. However, since the process of tensor completion generates many large-scale temporary matrices and tensors, it requires expensive computing cost and memory cost. Therefore, some parallel solutions for tensor completion [12, 13] are explored to enhance the computing efficiency. Additionally, to reduce the memory cost, Tang et al. [3] decomposed the original tensor into several sub-tensors. However, the computational cost still increases with the number of images.

To this end, we have to develop a high-efficiency image retagging framework to effectively assign social images with high-quality tags, regardless of large-scale image data. We investigate that Anchor Graph Regularization (AGR) can significantly accelerate large-scale graph learning only by exploring a small number of anchor points [14, 15] on the graph. Inspired by this, we present a Social anchor-Unit GrApH Regularized tensor Completion (SUGAR-TC) model on an image-tag-user graph only exploring a small number of representative anchor units, as shown in Figure 1. Accordingly, we propose a novel Social anchor-Unit GrApH Regularized Tensor Completion (SUGAR-TC) method to effectively refine and assign tags of social images. The framework of SUGAR-TC is shown in Figure 2, which mainly consists of three modules. (a) Anchor-unit graph module. We employ the co-clustering algorithm to obtain the representative anchor units in multiple domains (i.e., image and user domains) rather than traditional anchors in a single domain, and then construct a social anchor-unit graph. (b) SUGAR tensor completion module. We formulate a tensor completion model with anchor-unit graph regularization, and implement it on the original image-tag-user tensor to refine tags of anchor images. (c) Anchor-aware tag assignment module. By leveraging the potential relationships between images and anchors, we use the weighted average tags of anchor images to efficiently assign high-quality tags to non-anchor images.

Overall, the main contributions of this work are two-fold. (1) We propose an effective Social anchor-Unit GrApH Regularized Tensor Completion (SUGAR-TC) method for social image retagging, even though when there is a large-scale data set. (2) To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that anchor units across multiple domains rather than the traditional anchors in a single domain is presented. In experiments, the proposed SUGAR-TC gains superior performance compared with the state-of-the-art.

2 RELATED WORK

This section reviews works related to image tag refinement and anchor-based graph model, separately.

2.1 Social Image Retagging

The goal of social image retagging is to improve tag quality by automatically refine missing tags and assigning high-quality tags [1]. It is an essential step for large-scale tag-based image retrieval. The image retagging task is closely related to social image annotation [17], tag refinement [3], tag completion [6]. Overall, social image retagging methods have gone through three stages, i.e., intra image-tag association based image retagging method [7, 8], [19, 20], inter/intra image-tag association based image retagging method [4, 6, 21, 22, 23, 24], and inter/intra image-tag-user association based image retagging [2, 3, 5, 25].

The intra-image-tag association based image retagging method focuses on exploring semantic intra-correlation among tags and visual intra-similarity among images. As one of the most classic work, Liu et al. [7] assumed that two images with higher visual similarity are more likely to have similar tags, or even share the common tags. Subsequently, a growing number of the improved methods are proposed to perform image retagging by modeling image and tag intra-association. For example, Yang et al. [9] proposed to mine the
multi-tag intra-association for tag expansion and denoising. Chen et al. [20] proposed co-regularized learning with two classifiers by jointly mapping visual features and text features into a common subspace. However, such methods did not consider the inter-association between images and tags.

Therefore, inter/intra image-tag association based image retagging method is studied to explore the inter-association between images and tags, besides the image-tag intra-association. As an early study, Zhu et al. [4] solved the image retagging problem by factorizing the image-tag inter-association matrix into a approximately low-rank completed matrix and a sparse error matrix, where this low-rank completed matrix reveals the image-tag relationships. Besides, Feng et al. [25] theoretically analyze that their proposed noisy tag matrix is able to simultaneously recover missing tags and de-emphasize noisy tags even with a limited number of observations.

Following the inter/intra image-tag association based image retagging, inter/intra image-tag-user association based image retagging method further constructs an image-tag-user inter-association tensor instead of the image-tag inter-association matrix to employ the important user information [5]. It can further improve the performance of image retagging with the help of user information. As the state-of-the-art method, Tang et al. [3] proposed Tri-clustered Tensor Completion (TTC) framework to first divide the original super-sparse tensor into several sub-tensors, and complete all sub-tensors regularized by a tensor kernel. However, to a certain degree, TTC will break the image-tag-user inter-association when dividing the original super-sparse tensor into several sub-tensors.

2.2 Anchor-based Graph Model

Traditional graph learning methods have achieved impressive performance in various applications. However, such methods require much computational cost when the size of data set rapidly increases with time. Therefore, several strategies have been proposed to reduce the computational cost of graph learning model. To sum up, these strategies can be summarized into three categories. The first strategy uses neighborhood propagation from the approximate neighborhood graph to current graph [27], [28] or present the label propagation scheme among data [29], [30]. The second strategy utilizes the hashing strategy to improve the performance in terms of efficiency [31], [32], [33], [34].

The last strategy adopts the anchor strategy to construct an anchor-based graph with non-anchor datapoints and anchors, which can simultaneously reduce computational cost and storage cost [15], [35], [36], [37], [38]. On an anchor-based graph, anchors covering vast point (data) cloud can predict the label for each data point, even though when the data size is large. As a result, the anchor-based graph model has been successfully applied to solve many practical tasks, including image retrieval [39], face recognition [40], multi-graph learning [9], image classification [15], object tracking [41], and so on. In spite of these, the application of anchor-based graph model still has some limitations. In this paper, we will leverage the anchor-based graph model to well address the problem of image retagging, which be detailed in the following.

3 THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

This section introduces the whole framework of the proposed SUGAR-TC, which includes three main modules, i.e., Social anchor-unit graph module, SUGAR tensor completion module, and Anchor-aware tag assignment module. In this paper, tensors, matrices, vectors, variables and sets are denoted by calligraphic uppercase letters (e.g., $A$), bold uppercase letters (e.g., $T$), bold lowercase letters (e.g., $d$), letters (e.g., $m, l$) and blackboard bold letters (e.g., $I$), respectively. $T_{i,j,k}$ denotes the $i$-th row, $j$-th column and $k$-th tube entry of $T$. $|I|$ denotes the number of data in set $I$. $A_{[1]}, A_{[2]}$ and $A_{[3]}$ are the matrices form of $A$ by accumulating the entries of $A$ along the row, column, and tube axes, respectively.

3.1 Problem Definition

In this work, three types of data sets are collected from photo sharing websites, namely the image set $I = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{|I|}$, the tag set $T = \{t_j\}_{j=1}^{|T|}$ and the user set $U = \{u_k\}_{k=1}^{|U|}$, where $|I|$, $|T|$ and $|U|$ denote the sizes of the image set, the tag set, and the user set, respectively. $x_i, t_j$ and $u_k$ denote the $i$-th image, the $j$-th tag, and the $k$-th user, respectively. Since many tags of images freely given by users with various backgrounds and interests are ambiguous, noisy and incomplete, their original provided tags are weakly-supervised, which cannot represent the semantics of images well. This will degrade the performance of tag-based image retrieval, if we directly implement the tag-based image retrieval on social images with original tags.

Sang et al. [5] validated that both visual information and user information can reveal the important hints on the (in)correct tags of social images. This motivates us to assign high-quality tags to social images by simultaneously mining the inter-association among tags, images and users on an image-tag-user graph. However, the number of images, tags and users is large, and even huge on photo sharing websites. This will dramatically increase the computational cost when we assign tags to all images by existing image retagging methods [3] on such image-tag-user graph. Inspired by the success of anchor graph regularization on large-scale graph learning model, we can obtain the representative anchors to cover the distribution of all data on this graph. Unlike traditional anchors in a single domain, we need to define a new anchors across image domain and user domain on the image-tag-user graph. In this paper, this new anchor is called anchor units, and then this constructed graph is called anchor-unit graph. Alternately, the goal of this work is to develop an efficient image retagging method to effectively refine images on the anchor-unit graph, of which the number is much less than the number of all original data. If the anchor images obtains the high-quality tag, we can efficiently refine tags of non-anchor images based on the inter association between the non-anchor data (data in the original data set is not the anchor data) and the anchor data on the anchor-unit graph.

To this end, we propose an effective Social anchor-Unit GrAPh Regularized Tensor Completion (SUGAR-TC) method to efficiently refine tags of social images. The framework of SUGAR-TC mainly consists of three modules, i.e, Social anchor-unit graph, SUGAR tensor completion,
and Anchor-aware tag assignment, which are introduced in details as follows.

### 3.2 Social Anchor-Unit Graph

To construct the anchor-unit graph, we need to obtain the anchor units from all image and user data sets. Generally speaking, the perfect anchor units should satisfy two key conditions, 1) they can adequately cover the vast point (data) cloud; 2) the number of the anchor units should be much fewer or smaller than the number of all data. Therefore, existing methods employ the K-means clustering algorithm to obtain the representative anchors. Specifically, the K-means algorithm is performed on all data points to obtain the several cluster centers, which act as representative anchor points [33, 36].

As we know, the co-clustering algorithm can construct the relationship between two types of data by an associated matrix, and then cluster rows and columns of this matrix simultaneously into several co-clusters [42]. For our case, we can build an associated image-user matrix $T(1) \in \mathbb{R}^{[|I|] \times [|U|]}$ by accumulating entries of tensor $\mathcal{T}$ along the tag axis, and adopt the co-clustering algorithm instead of the K-means algorithm to find $C$ co-cluster centers. Subsequently, we use $m_c$ image-user unit (a user uploads this image) that is most close to the $c$-th co-cluster center as the anchor unit. In total, we can obtain $m$ image-user anchor units for $C$ co-cluster centers, where $m = m_c \times C$.

Formally, we construct a new social anchor-unit graph $\Omega \{I_n, U_n, U_m, U_m, T, \omega\}$, where $I_n$, $U_n$, $I_m$, and $U_m$ indicate the non-anchor image set (contains all non-anchor images), the non-anchor user set (contains all non-anchor users), the anchor image set, and the anchor user set respectively. $T$ denotes the tag set, $\omega$ indicates the collection of the adjacency edges between two data. To measure the weight of each edge in anchor-unit graph $\Omega$, we design two types of inter-adjacency matrices between non-anchor data and anchor data (i.e., image inter-adjacency matrix and user inter-adjacency matrix), and two types of intra-adjacency matrices among two non-anchor data (i.e., image intra-adjacency matrix and user intra-adjacency matrix).

#### Design inter-adjacency matrices.
Firstly, we design the adjacency matrix $I^m \in \mathbb{R}^{[I]_m \times [I]_m}$ between $|I|_n$ non-anchor images and $|I|_m$ anchor images $(|I|_n + |I|_m = |I|)$, i.e.,

$$I^m_{i,j} = \exp \left( - \frac{||d_{x_i} - d_{x_j}||^2}{\sigma^2} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma$ is a parameter of the RBF kernel, $d_{x_i}$ and $d_{x_j}$ indicate features (i.e., CNN feature) of a non-anchor image $x_i$ and an anchor image $x_j$, respectively. Second, we can also design adjacency matrix $U^m \in \mathbb{R}^{[U]_n \times [U]_m}$ between the $|U|_n$ non-anchor users and $|U|_m$ anchor users, where $(|U|_n + |U|_m = |U|)$. Similar to $\Omega$, we assume that two users with higher co-occurrence are more likely to related with each other, and vice versa, namely

$$U^m_{i,j} = \frac{N(u_i, u_j)}{N(u_i) + N(u_j) - N(u_i, u_j)}, \quad (2)$$

where $N(u_i, u_j)$ denotes the number of groups that both a non-anchor user $u_i$ and an anchor user $u_j$ join, and $N(u_i)$ is the number of groups that a non-anchor user $u_i$ joins, $N(u_j)$ is the number of groups that an anchor user $u_j$ joins.

#### Design intra-adjacency matrices.
First, we design image intra-adjacency matrix $W^I \in \mathbb{R}^{[I]_m \times [I]_n}$ between two non-anchor images. One strategy is that we can measure the relationship between two non-anchor images by Eq. (1). However, the number of images is much larger than the number of anchor images, which will increase the computational cost. Alternately, since anchor images are very representative in whole image set, we can measure the relationship between non-anchor images by exploring links among common anchor images, which has also been claimed in [14, 15]. For two non-anchor images, the more number of common anchor images two non-anchor images share, the closer relationship of such two non-anchor images is. Thus, $W^I \in \mathbb{R}^{[I]_m \times [I]_n}$ can be effectively computed by the following equation:

$$W^I = I^m (L^I)^{-1} (I^m)^T, \quad (3)$$

where the diagonal matrix $L^I$ is defined as $L^I_{i,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{[|I|]} I^m_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq j \leq [|I|_m]$). From Eq. (1), if $W^I_{i,j} > 0$, it means two non-anchor images share at least one anchor user, and otherwise $W^I_{i,j} = 0$. Second, we use the same idea to design user intra-adjacency matrix $W^U \in \mathbb{R}^{[U]_n \times [U]_n}$ between two non-anchor users, as follows,

$$W^U = U^m (L^U)^{-1} (U^m)^T, \quad (4)$$

where the diagonal matrix $L^U$ is defined as $L^U_{i,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{[|U|]} U^m_{i,j}$. Following [2, 3], we also use the categorical relations and the co-occurrence to measure the similarity between tag $t_i$ and tag $t_j$, i.e.,

$$T_{i,j} = a_1 \frac{N(t_i, t_j)}{N(t_i) + N(t_j) - N(t_i, t_j)} + a_2 \frac{2C(L(t_i, t_j))}{C(t_i) + C(t_j)}, \quad (5)$$

where $a_1$ and $a_2$ denote the weighted coefficients ($a_1 + a_2 = 1$); $N(t_i)$ denotes the occurrence count of tag $t_i$; $N(t_i, t_j)$ denotes the co-occurrence count for tags $t_i$ and $t_j$; $C(t_i)$ is the information content of tag $t_i$; and $L(t_i, t_j)$ is the least common subsumer of tags $t_i$ and $t_j$ in the WordNet taxonomy.

After we construct social anchor-unit graph $\Omega$, we can formulate a social anchor-unit graph regularization model. It has been proved that Anchor Graph Regularization can effectively deal with the standard multi-class semi-supervised learning problem[1]. Motivated by this, we extend the Anchor Graph Regularization to a novel Social anchor-Unit GrApH Regularization (SUGAR). Specifically, it can be assumed that two images linked by the same anchor image have two closely correlated tags and two closely similar owners (who uploaded these images), and vice versa; two users linked by the same anchor users prefer to upload images with the closely correlated tags, and vice versa. Formally, we define an image-tag-user tensor $A \in \mathbb{R}^{[T] \times |I|_m \times |U|_n}$ to correctly represent the inter-relationship among tags, anchor images and anchor users on anchor-unit graph, and this

1. More details can be found in [35].
tensor $\mathcal{A}$ can be learned by minimizing regularization $\Theta_1$ respectively, as follows,

$$
\Theta_1 = \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m - A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right)
+ \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m - A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right),
$$

(6)

where both $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are the trade-off parameters to control the penalty of the corresponding regularization terms, $A \times I_{i,:}^m$ denotes the 2-mode product of $A$ and $I_{i,:}^m$, where more details about $n$-mode product can be found in [44]. In Eq. (6), the first term measures two images' similarity consistent with the inter-relationship between users and tags (tags and users are associated with these two images), while the second one measures two users' similarity consistent with the inter-relationship between images and users (images and users are associated with these two users).

### 3.3 SUGAR Tensor Completion

The great number of original tags provided by users on websites involve the important supervised information, which can guide us to mine the inter-relationship among images, tags, and users [5]. Accordingly, we construct an image-tag-user associated tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{[T] \times [I] \times [U] \times [n]}$ to represent the inter-relationship among tags, non-anchor images and non-anchor users on image-tag-user graph. Specifically, if the $i$-th non-anchor image uploaded by the $k$-th non-anchor user is annotated with the $j$-th tag, we set $T_{i,j,k} = 1$, otherwise $T_{i,j,k} = 0$, where $1 \leq i \leq [T]$, $1 \leq j \leq [I]$, and $1 \leq k \leq [U]$. For a tensor with a few available entries, the tensor completion algorithm can estimate missing entries and remove the noisy ones by reconstructing an approximately low-rank tensor $\tilde{T}$, as follows,

$$
\min_{\tilde{T}} \|\mathcal{T} - \tilde{T}\|_F^2.
$$

(7)

Furthermore, the Tucker decomposition [45] of tensor provides a factorization way to solve the low-rank tensor $\tilde{T}$ by the following objective function, i.e.,

$$
\min_{\tilde{T}} \|\mathcal{T} - \tilde{T}\|_F^2 = \|\tilde{T} - S \times_1 B \times_2 C \times_3 D\|_F^2,
$$

(8)

where $\tilde{T} = S \times_1 B \times_2 C \times_3 D$. Here, $S$ denotes the core tensor; $B$, $C$, and $D$ denote the factor matrices. Given the original tags of anchor images, we can refine tags of anchor images by leveraging the tensor completion algorithm. Here, by regarding the desired completed tensor $\mathcal{A}$ as the core tensor, $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{I}^m$ and $\mathbf{U}^m$ as factor matrices, we can solve the desired completed tensor $\mathcal{A}$ by minimizing the following tensor completion function $\Theta_2$, i.e.,

$$
\Theta_2 = \|\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{A} \times_1 \mathbf{T} \times_2 \mathbf{I}^m \times_3 \mathbf{U}^m\|_F^2 + \beta \|\mathcal{A}\|_F^2,
$$

(9)

where the parameter $\beta$ is a nonnegative coefficient to control the penalty of the regularization term that avoids the overfitting problem. In Eq. (9), $\mathcal{A}$ is a low-rank and compact tensor, which correctly reveals the relationship of images and tags.

We integrate social anchor-graph regularization (i.e., Eq. (6)) in the above section into Eq. (9) and we can solve the completed tensor $\mathcal{A}$ by minimizing an objective function $\Theta = \Theta_1 + \Theta_2$, as follows,

$$
\min_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m - A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right)
+ \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m - A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right)
+ \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right)
+ \lambda_2 \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right).
$$

(10)

In this work, we learn $\mathcal{A}$ of objective function $\Theta$ in an iteratively updating way. Specifically, we compute the partial derivatives of the objective function $\Theta$ with respect to $\mathcal{A}$, i.e.,

$$
\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial \mathcal{A}} = 2\mathcal{A} \times_1 \left( \mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T} \right) \times_2 \left( \mathbf{I}^m \times_3 \mathbf{U}^m \right) + 2\mathcal{A} \times_1 \left( \mathbf{I}^m \times_3 \mathbf{U}^m \right)
+ 2\mathcal{A} \times_1 \left( \mathbf{I}^m \times_2 \mathbf{T} \right) \times_3 \left( \mathbf{U}^m \times_3 \mathbf{U}^m \right)
+ \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m - A \times 2 I_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right)
+ \lambda_2 \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{[I]} W_{i,j} \left( \|A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m - A \times 3 U_{i,:}^m \|_F^2 \right).
$$

(11)

where $a_i = I_{i,:}^m$, $a_j = I_{j,:}^m$, $b_i = U_{i,:}^m$, and $b_j = U_{j,:}^m$. Therefore, the multiplicative update procedure of $\mathcal{A}$ can be defined as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \odot \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial \mathcal{A}}$, where $\odot$ is element-wise product operator. The details of the SUGAR Tensor Completion algorithm are described in Algorithm 1. Here, the convergence criterion is that the iteration will stop when the relative cost of the objective function is smaller than a predefined threshold.

### 3.4 Anchor-Aware Tag Assignment

After obtaining the optimized completed tensor $\mathcal{A}$ in the anchor-unit set, we accumulate its entries along the user axis to acquire the desired image-tag relation $A_{[2]}$ and user-tag relation matrix $A_{[2]}$, respectively. Therefore, we can employ the completed tags associated with anchor units to predict...
tags for non-anchor images. For example, for one non-anchor image $x_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \cdots, |\mathbb{I}|_n$) with an available user $u_k$ ($k = 1, 2, \cdots, |\mathbb{U}|_n$), we use the weighted average of tags of $s$ nearest-neighbor anchor units to estimate its tag vector $y_i$, as follows,

$$y_i = \sum_{<j>} \left( \frac{\gamma_1}{s} I_{i,\langle j\rangle} (A_{[3]}{\vdots}_{\langle j\rangle}) + \frac{\gamma_2}{s} U_{k,\langle j\rangle} (A_{[2]}{\vdots}_{\langle j\rangle}) \right),$$

(12)

where $< j >$ is an index set of $s$ closest anchor units of $x_i$, $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ ($\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$) are the weighted coefficients to control the degree of image-tag and user-tag association respectively. Finally, we rerank the elements of $y_i$ based on the values in the descending order, and select top 10 (if there are) tags as final tags of image $x_i$.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Dataset

We conduct experiments on a real-world social dataset to evaluate performance of the proposed SUGAR-TC method. Since SUGAR-TC considers user information, only NUS-WIDE-128 dataset [46] with user information is suitable for evaluation. NUS-WIDE-128 is extended on the widely-used NUS-WIDE dataset [47], and contains 269,648 images, 5,018 tags, as well as 128 ground-truth concepts for evaluation. In NUS-WIDE-128, we delete some images without user ID, since they have invalid links to users or are deleted by users. Finally, we obtain 247,849 images with 49,528 user IDs (with the information of user group), as shown in Table 1. In experiments, F-score is used to perform the evaluation of social image retagging, i.e., F-score $= \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># image</td>
<td>247,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># tag</td>
<td>5,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># user</td>
<td>49,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># annotated concepts</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># tags per image (on average)</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># images per user (on average)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Experimental Settings

In the social anchor-unit graph module, the number of image centers and user clusters are set to 40 and 12, respectively. Thus, the number of co-cluster centers is $C = 40 \times 12 = 480$. The number of anchor units is set $m_e = 10$ for each co-cluster center, and then number of all anchor units is $m_e = m_e \times C = 4800$. The radius parameter $\delta$ in Eq. (1) is set to 2.5. And following [3], the weighted coefficients $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ in Eq. (2) are set to 0.9 and 0.1 respectively. In the SUGAR tensor completion module, we tune the parameters, i.e., $\beta$, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ in objective function $\Theta$, to the optimal values. In the anchor-aware tag assignment module, the proposed method achieves optimal performance when $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are set to 0.8 and 0.2, respectively.

We conduct experiments to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed SUGAR-TC compared with three image retagging methods and the baseline, which are briefly introduced as follows,

- Original Tagging (OT): it directly measures the F-score on the original user-provided tags of images.
- TRVSC [7]: it refines tags of social images by exploring the consistency between visual similarity and tag correlation simultaneously.
- LR [4]: image retagging problem is formulated to decompose the original image-tag matrix into a low-rank completed image-tag matrix and a sparse error matrix, where this image-tag matrix reflects the relationship between images and tags.
- MRTF [5]: image retagging is formulated as a multi-correlation regularized tensor (image-tag-user tensor) factorization on the original large-scale image-tag-user tensor.
- TTC1 and TTC2 [3]: tri-clustering algorithm firstly divides the original image-tag-user tensor into a certain number of sub-tensors, and then implements the tensor completion on such sub-tensors. Here, all sub-tensors are related by adding a tensor kernel.

For the parameter settings of LR and MRTF, we tune the optimized parameters on the dataset and report the best performance. For TRVSC and TTC, the values of model parameters are same as the values in [3, 7]. It is noted that LR and TRVSC are performed on NUS-WIDE-128 without user data since these methods do not consider user information. All methods in experiments are implemented on a server with a 8-core 2.67 GHz CPU and 32 GB memory.

4.3 Results and Analysis

The average F-scores obtained by different methods are shown in Table 2. We find that the proposed SUGAR-TC achieves the highest F-score compared to other related methods. Both of MRTF and TTC utilize the inter- and intra-associations among images, tags and users, thus they perform better than TRVSC and LR. In particular, since TTC addresses the super-sparse problem existing in the original tensor, it gains the higher F-score than MRTF that directly completes the entries in the original tensor. However, to a certain degree, TTC breaks the latent inter-relationship among images, tags and users, when dividing the original tensor into several sub-tensors. In turn, the proposed SUGAR-TC did not break the inherent image-tag-user inter-relationship. Thus, the F-score achieved by SUGAR-TC is 0.474, which is about 2% higher than 0.458 of TTC.

We further detail F-scores of different methods on each concept, as shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively. We can see that SUGAR-TC achieves the highest F-scores on the most of the concepts. In particular, since the frequently-used tags (e.g., "bus", "flowers", "sunset", and "food", etc) in Figure 3 and Figure 4 are very common, SUGAR-TC shows remarkable improvement than other methods. We can also see that all image retagging methods improve the quality of almost all concepts compared with OT. By adding user information, MRTF, TTC and SUGAR-TC perform better than LR and TRVSC, especially for some summarized or
TABLE 2
Average performances of different methods for image retagging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-scores</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. The comparisons of detailed F-scores on the 128 concepts by different methods (followed by Figure 4). For some concepts denoted with black bounding boxes, the proposed SUGAR-TC shows remarkable improvements. Best view in color.

complex tags (e.g., “military”, “nighttime”, and “cityscape”). Moreover, TTC achieves the better performance than MRTF for some geo-related tags (e.g., “beach”, “garden” and “harbor”), some event tags (e.g., “earthquake”, “soccer”, “surf” and “wedding”) and ambiguous tags (e.g., “fox”, “map” and “rocks”), since TTC completes missing relationship among images, tags and users on the more compact sub-tensors.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of SUGAR-TC, we also show some tag assignment results for some specific cases, as shown in Figure 5. We can see that SUGAR-TC can effectively assign tags of images, even though there are some globally complex images (e.g., Figure 5(d)) and locally abstract images (e.g., Figure 5(i)), since SUGAR-TC can simultaneously minimize the context information and semantic relation among images, tags and users. Besides, although some tags, i.e., geo-related tags, event tags, and time-related tags, are hardly inferred by using visual information, SUGAR-TC considering extra user information can correctly infer them. For example, as shown in Figure 5(a), the train is a landmark of Japan, thus this image should be tagged with the geo-related tags “Japan”. It is very difficult to restore the relation between the tag “Japan” and this image by only mining the visual and tag information, but SUGAR-TC can do it well based on the user background information. Similarly in Figure 5(b), this image shows the Obama’s speaking action of the United States presidential election, it is reasonable to assign the event tag “election” to this image.

To illustrate the high efficiency of the proposed SUGAR-TC, we also report the computing time of TTC and the related methods, which is presented in Figure 6. It can be concluded that: 1) the proposed SUGAR-TC with computing time 1.2h runs much faster than MRTF and TTC (two versions, i.e., TTC1 and TT2), although MRTF and TTC1 require less computing time than TT2, the former one needs larger memory space; 2) the proposed SUGAR-TC for image retagging is more effective and efficient than other image retagging methods.

2. Here, we do not consider the computing time of tri-clustering (about 4 hours) in TTC and tri-clustering in SUGAR-TC (about 2 hours). More details about TTC1 and TTC2 can be found in [3].
4.4 Application: Images Retrieval

In this work, for each image, image retagging task cannot only add and remove tags, but also re-rank the completed tag list by assigning tags with different confidence scores. For each image, we can obtain a tag ranking list, which can improve the performance of tag-based image retrieval. Therefore, we conduct experiment of tag-based image retrieval to illustrate the effectiveness of SUGAR by comparing with other related methods, including TRVSC [7], LR [4], MRTF [5], and TTC [3].

Following the experimental setting in [7], we perform tag-based social image retrieval with ten queries on NUS-WIDE-128, i.e., birds, building, butterfly, dog, fish, flowers, horses, plane, and sunset and zoo. Average Precision


