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Abstract

Deep learning stands at the forefront in many computer vision tasks. However, deep neural networks are usually data-hungry and require a huge amount of well-annotated training samples. Collecting sufficient annotated data is very expensive in many applications, especially for pixel-level prediction tasks such as semantic segmentation. To solve this fundamental issue, we consider a new challenging vision task, Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, which only uses Internet data with noisy image-level supervision of corresponding query keywords for segmentation model training. We address this task by proposing the following solution. A class-specific attention model unifying multiscale forward and backward convolutional features is proposed to provide initial segmentation “ground truth”. The model trained with such noisy annotations is then improved by an online fine-tuning procedure. It achieves state-of-the-art performance under the weakly-supervised setting on PASCAL VOC2012 dataset. The proposed framework also paves a new way towards learning from the Internet without human interaction and could serve as a strong baseline therein. Code and data will be released upon the paper acceptance.

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks (DNNs) have been shown useful \cite{30, 26, 18} for many computer vision tasks, but they are still limited by requiring large-scale well-annotated datasets for network training. However, manual labeling is costly, time-consuming, and requires massive human intervention for every new task. This is often impractical, especially for pixel-wise prediction such as semantic segmentation. On the other hand, multimedia (e.g., images with user tags) on the Internet is growing rapidly. Thus it is natural to think of training deep networks with data from the Internet. While certain progress in this thread has been achieved by using Internet data as the extra training set together with some well-annotated datasets \cite{34, 7, 12}, how to automatically learn semantic pixel-wise labeling from the Internet without any human interaction has not been exploited.

To address this data shortage problem, we propose a principled learning framework for semantic segmentation, which aims at assigning a semantic category label for each pixel in an image. We are particularly interested in utilizing the Internet as the only supervision source for training DNNs to segment arbitrary target semantic categories without requiring any additional human annotation efforts. To this end, we first present this new problem in Section\textsuperscript{2} which is called Internetly supervised semantic segmentation. Specifically, unlike previous weakly supervised semantic segmentation, the supervision of human-cleaned image tags \cite{19, 21, 23}, bounding boxes \cite{3, 10}, as well as auxiliary cues (e.g. saliency maps \cite{37, 35}, edges \cite{25, 23}, attention \cite{9, 27}) that are trained with strong supervisions, should not be used in our new task.
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Compared with previous weakly-supervised semantic segmentation that is limited to pre-defined categories due to the limitation of human-annotated training data, Internetly supervised semantic segmentation can learn to segment arbitrary semantic categories. Moreover, the accuracy of previous weakly supervised semantic segmentation heavily depends on the auxiliary cues (e.g. saliency, edges, and attention) that are trained with strong supervision such as pixel-accurate label maps or human annotated tags, inferior to our Internetly supervised segmentation method. On the other hand, the Internetly supervised task is partially similar to unsupervised learning because both of them aim at learning to describe hidden structures from free available data. Unsupervised learning usually uses unlabeled videos or raw images to learn edges, foreground masks, video representation, etc; and it can not learn semantic information with multiple categories. Since more free information (i.e. the Internet tags/texts) is used in our Internetly supervised task, it can learn pixel-wise semantic labeling.

We search and download images from Flickr using the tags of target categories. Thus each target category can correspond to a large number of noisy images that may contain target objects. We use a simple filtering strategy to clean the crawled Internet images, and an image classification network is subsequently trained using the de-noised data. We also propose a new class-specific attention model that unifies multiscale forward and backward convolutional feature maps of the classification network to obtain high-quality attention maps. These attention maps are converted to “ground truth” using a trimap strategy. The generated “ground truth” is used as the supervision to train the semantic segmentation network and get the initial segmentation model. Then, an online fine-tuning procedure is proposed to improve the initial model.

In summary, our contributions include:

- We introduce a new challenging vision task, Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, to learn pixel-wise labeling from the Internet without any human interaction.
- We propose a robust attention model that generates class-specific attention maps by unifying multiscale forward and backward feature maps of the image classification networks. Those maps are further refined by a trimap strategy to provide initial “ground truth” for the training of semantic segmentation.
- We propose an online fine-tuning method to improve the initially trained model, so that the final model can perform well although trained from noisy image-level supervision.

We conduct the numeric comparison of our proposed method and some weakly supervised methods that only use image-level supervision on the PASCAL VOC2012 dataset. Our method achieves state-of-the-art performance and is even better than these competitors when they use human-annotated image tags and PASCAL VOC images for training.

2 Problem Setup

We first define the new Internetly supervised semantic segmentation task.

**Definition 1.** Internetly supervised semantic segmentation only uses Internet data with noisy image-level supervision to learn to perform semantic segmentation, without any human interaction. Internet data can be collected using various search engines (e.g. Google, Bing, Baidu, and Flickr, etc) or web crawling techniques, but only category information can be used in the search process.

**Remark 1.** In this task, any human interaction is not allowed. This makes it more challenging than existing segmentation tasks. For example, one can not manually clean the collected noisy data, and can not use other human-annotated datasets, e.g. to train auxiliary cues such as saliency, edge, object proposals and attention models or get ImageNet pre-trained models. The only available information is the noisy Internet data.

The goal of unsupervised learning is to learn knowledge from free data such as unannotated videos and raw images. Similar to unsupervised learning, the proposed new task aims at learning from free data (i.e. the Internet images), too. This new task is also related to weakly supervised semantic segmentation. Weakly supervised methods can be roughly divided into three categories according
to their supervision levels. Methods in the first category [19, 21–23] only use image-level labels, which is the simplest supervision. Methods in the second category [13, 25, 27, 9, 28, 35–37, 12] not only use image-level labels but also many strongly-supervised auxiliary cues, e.g. saliency, edges/boundaries, attention, or object proposals, etc. Methods in the third category [3, 15, 11, 33, 10] use coarser annotations, such as scribbles [15, 15], bounding boxes [3, 10], and instance points [11].

Compared to aforementioned weakly-supervised semantic segmentation, Internetly supervised semantic segmentation uses the least supervision of noisy Internet data. Besides, [19, 21–23] use carefully annotated datasets with image tags, so they are limited to a few pre-defined semantic categories. Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, by contrast, search images with target category tags from Internet, and thus has the capability to learn to segment objects of arbitrary categories. Although these image-level supervision based methods can be directly applied to Internet data, our experiments in Section 4 show these methods struggle on the noisy data.

[13, 25, 27, 9, 28, 35–37, 12] have significantly improved the segmentation performance using various auxiliary cues. However, they are limited to only a few semantic categories. Moreover, the results heavily rely on the accuracies of the adopted auxiliary cues. Besides, since these methods usually use different strategies to generate ground-truth with different auxiliary cues and datasets, it is unclear how each component (i.e. auxiliary cues, ground-truth generation methods, learning approaches, and adopted datasets) contributes to the final performance. For example, Wei et al. [37] use saliency maps generated by non-deep algorithm [11], while Hou et al. [9] use both saliency maps generated by deep learning based method [8] and attention maps generated by [40]. Internetly supervised semantic segmentation is advantageous in this case, because it not only advocates more intelligent systems by utilizing massive Internet data with minimum human efforts, but also provides a uniform testbed to re-gauge state-of-the-arts.

[3, 15, 11, 33, 10] use some sparse annotations as the supervision to reduce the cost of human interaction. But Internetly supervised semantic segmentation aims at full automatic learning systems, not semi-supervised ones. With target categories as inputs, automatically learning pixel-wise knowledge from the Internet is more useful in many practical applications and also more consistent with the future goal of artificial intelligence. According to the definition of Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, two open problems exist here: (i) how to de-noise the Internet data; (ii) how to learn pixel-wise knowledge only with noisy image-level supervision. Hence it is a more challenging task than the previous weakly-supervised task.

3 Our Approach

Above we establish the new task of Internetly supervised semantic segmentation and analyze its differences from previous weakly-supervised semantic segmentation. In this section, we propose our approach to this new task. Note that the key point of a possible solution is how to learn from noisy data. To this end, we first introduce our class-specific attention model that can generate attention maps with noisy image labels. Then, an online fine-tuning process is further employed to improve the segmentation model. The whole system and implementation details are provided at the end.

3.1 Class-specific Attention Model

Some class-specific attention models [39, 29, 41, 40] have been proposed to find neural attention regions using image classification networks. Neural attention regions usually cover discriminative objects or object parts in an input image and thus can be viewed as the coarse masks for a specific category. For Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, it is more challenging to find discriminative regions as the associated tags are highly noisy. For example, an image obtained by using the search tag “dog” may not contain a dog at all, and an image obtained by using the search tag “bicycle” may contain not only bicycles but also riders. The attention model should be robust for handling these cases. Besides, we expect the computed attention maps can cover complete objects instead of the most discriminative object-parts [35], e.g. the complete person rather than his/her face. We address these two challenges by developing the following new model.

It is widely accepted that the bottom layers of DNNs contain fine details of an image but less discriminative representations, and the top layers have abstract discriminative representation but less fine details. Many network architectures [38, 17, 16] have been proposed to fuse the bottom and top
features for various vision tasks. This idea is consistent with our goal to estimate the attention maps of complete objects. However, it is non-trivial to locate objects directly using top/bottom features. The features generated bottom layers usually capture representation of textures and edges. It is highly challenging to find discriminative objects using these features. We unify multiscale information from the forward and backward pass of a classification network and propose a new attention model that works well for localizing objects in our Internet learning system.

Formally, suppose we have a dataset \( D = \{(I_n, G_n^{Cls})\}_{n=1}^N \) of \( N \) pairs, where \( I_n \) represents an Internet image, and \( G_n^{Cls} \) is its corresponding noisy category label coming from the set \( \mathcal{K} = \{1, \ldots, K\} \) of \( K \) classes. Our goal is to estimate the semantic segmentation mask \( G_n^{Seg} \) for image \( I_n \).

With Internet data, we can learn a function \( F : I \rightarrow G^{Cls} \), representing a ConvNet \( F \) is a non-linear composition function that consists of multiple levels of a hierarchy indexed by \( l \in \{1, \ldots, L\} \), where each level of the hierarchy consists of commonly used operators such as convolution and pooling.

More formally, given an image \( I_n, F \) is defined as:

\[
F(I_n) = f_L(f_{L-1}( \ldots (f_1(I_n, w_1) \ldots ) ), w_{L-1}), w_L),
\]

where \( f_1 \) is a network layer with learnable parameters \( w_1 \) (for some layers that do not have learnable parameters, \( w_1 = 0 \)), and \( f^l_j \) represents the \( j \)-th channel or a neuron at the \( l \)-th layer. At the lowest level, the inputs to \( f_1 \) consists of images from Internet. Our proposed framework is generic and in this study \( F \) is embodied by a non-pretrained GoogleNet [32] whose last three layers are global average pooling, fully connected, and softmax. Suppose the input feature tensor of pooling layer is \( f_{L-3}^c(x, y) \), \( 0 < c < C \), \( 0 \leq x < X \), \( 0 \leq y < Y \), where \( C \) is the number of channels, and \( X.Y \) represents the width/height. The top features \( f_{L-3}^c(x, y) \) is used to computed the attention scores at a coarse resolution as in [41]. Hence the output of global pooling is

\[
f_{L-2}^c = \frac{1}{XY} \sum_{x,y} f_{L-3}^c(x, y).
\]

At the fully connected layer, if we ignore the bias term, the output can be formulated as

\[
f_{L-1}^k = \sum_c w_{L-1}^{\ast, c} f_{L-2}^c = \frac{1}{XY} \sum_c \sum_{x,y} w_{L-1}^{\ast, c} f_{L-3}^c(x, y), \quad k \in \mathcal{K}
\]

in which \( w_{L-1}^{\ast, c} \) represents the weights. \( f_{L-1} = \{f_{L-1}^1, \ldots, f_{L-1}^K\} \) where \( K \) is number of target categories. So the probability to predict current input data as category \( k \) is

\[
P(k) = f_{L}^k = \frac{\exp(f_{L-1}^k)}{\sum_i \exp(f_{L-1}^i)}.
\]

From Eqn. (2) to Eqn. (4), one can find the importance of activation at \( (x, y) \) when classifying the input image \( I_n \) to category \( k \) is proportional to

\[
P^k(x, y) = \sum_c w_{L-1}^{\ast, c} f_{L-3}^c(x, y).
\]

We use \( P^k \) to represent the forward scores of attention, which aims at finding coarse locations that have large activations for class \( k \).

To obtain bottom features of attention, a backward operation is performed to explore the importance of activation at \( (x, y) \) in a high resolution [40]. The computation of current common neurons can be written as \( f_{i+1}^t = \sum_i w_{i+1}^{t, i} f_i^t \) in which \( f_i^t \) is the input of \( f_{i+1}^t \) and \( w_{i+1}^{t, i} \) is the weight. If the child node set of \( f_{i+1}^t \) (in top-down order) is \( C_{i+1}^{t} \) and \( f_i^t \in C_{i+1}^{t} \), the probability \( P(f_i^t | f_{i+1}^{t+1}) \) is defined as

\[
P(f_i^t | f_{i+1}^{t+1}) = \begin{cases} S_j w_{i+1}^{t, i} f_i^t & \text{if } w_{i+1}^{t, i} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

\[ S_j = 1/ \sum_{f_i^t \in C_{i+1}^{t}} w_{i+1}^{t, i} f_i^t \]

is the normalization term so that we have \( \sum_{f_i^t \in C_{i+1}^{t}} P(f_i^t | f_{i+1}^{t+1}) = 1 \). According to full probability formula, we have

\[
P(f_i^t) = \sum_{f_{i+1}^{t+1} \in P_i^t} P(f_i^t | f_{i+1}^{t+1})P(f_{i+1}^{t+1})
\]

The bias term can be absorbed into \( w_{i+1}^{t, i} \).
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\[
A^k = \lambda_1 \cdot \text{upsampling}(F^k, 32) + \lambda_2 \cdot \text{upsampling}(B_2^k, 4) \cdot \text{upsampling}(B_{3b}^k, 8),
\]

in which \( \text{upsampling}(\cdot, Z) \) is to upsample a feature map into dimensions of \( Z \) times using bilinear interpolation. \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are factors to balance the forward and backward features, and here are both set to 1. In Eqn. \((8)\), we multiply \( B_2^k \) and \( B_{3b}^k \) to provide the bottom features of backward pass that are then added to forward features. The rationale is because \( B_2^k \) and \( B_{3b}^k \) contain lots of noisy, and the multiplication, in this case, is likely to reduce the false alarms, as illustrated in Figure 1. On the other hand, \( F^k \) is in low dimensions and usually have large activations on the most discriminative object parts, so the add operation is employed to emphasize the discriminative object parts.

After obtaining the fused attention map \( A^k \) for class \( k \), a segment based smoothing is performed. For the image segmentation, \( \text{Li et al.} \) \cite{14} recently introduced an unsupervised edge detector. We use \cite{24} to convert the unsupervised edges into unsupervised image segments. Note this does not violate our “without human interaction” assumption because the edge-segment converter of \cite{24} is unsupervised.

Given an image, suppose the set of all segments is \( S \). The smoothing operation can be formulated as

\[
A^k(x, y) = \frac{1}{|s|} \sum_{s \in S \delta(x', y') \in s} 1[(x, y) \in s] \cdot A^k(x', y')
\]

where \( 1[\cdot] \) is the indicator function. A trimap strategy is then applied to convert \( A^k \) into the estimation of ground truth for image \( I_n \):

\[
G_{n}^{seg}(x, y) = \begin{cases} G_{n}^{cls} & \text{if } A_{n}^{G_{n}^{cls}}(x, y) > \delta_1, \\ 255 & \text{if } \delta_2 < A_{n}^{G_{n}^{cls}}(x, y) \leq \delta_1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

where \( \delta_1 > \delta_2 \) are two fixed thresholds. Since image \( I_n \) has noisy label \( G_{n}^{cls} \), only the category of \( G_{n}^{cls} \) is considered in Eqn. \((10)\). In the training process, \( G_{n}^{seg}(x, y) \) with the value of 255 is ignored. Thus Eqn. \((10)\) is to use pixels with confident labels for training, but ignore pixels with uncertain labels. An example of our attention model is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: An example of our attention model. From Left to Right of the Top row: Original image \( I_n \), forward feature map \( F^k \), backward feature maps \( B_2^k \) and \( B_{3b}^k \). From Left to Right of the bottom row: \( B_2^k \cdot B_{3b}^k \), attention map \( A^k \), attention map with image segments \( A^k \), and proxy “ground truth” \( G_{n}^{seg} \). Assume \( k = G_{n}^{cls} \) here. In the bottom right figure, white pixels represent ignored region, and purple pixels belong to the horse.
3.2 Online Fine-tuning Algorithm

Using aforementioned estimation of ground truth, we can train an initial model for semantic segmentation. To further improve the performance, we propose an online fine-tuning algorithm to improve the initial model. For the training of initial model, we use a subset of the downloaded Internet data. After this, the rest of the data is used for fine-tuning. Our motivation is that the attention maps and initial model may not perform well on specific images, but will generate complementary information on different images. Besides, the massive Internet data can serve us an infinite space to search for complementary information for a better solution.

Suppose the semantic segmentation network has weights $\Theta$ and the image classifier of GoogleNet \cite{Szegedy:2015} has weights $W$. Given a new image set $I = \{I_n\}_{0}^{N}$ with corresponding image label $G_{Cls}^{Cts} \in K$, we input each image $I_n$ into the semantic segmentation network. We compute a mask from the segmentation results as follows

$$M_n(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P(G^{Cts}_{n}, x, y | I_n; \Theta) \geq \max_{k \in K \cup \{0\}\setminus G^{Cts}_{n}} P(k, x, y | I_n; \Theta) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

in which $P(k, x, y)$ is the probability of the $k$-th category at position $(x, y)$. Then we compute the element-wise multiplication of $I_n \cdot M_n$, and feed $I_n \cdot M_n$ into the image classification network. If

$$P(G^{Cts}_{n} | I_n \cdot M_n; W) > \mu \quad (12)$$

where $\mu$ is a fixed threshold, $P(G^{Cts}_{n} | I_n; \Theta)$ is converted to $G^{Seg}_{n}$ using aforementioned segment smoothing and trimap strategy. We add $(I_n, G^{Seg}_{n})$ to the new training set $T = (I, G^{Seg})$. $T$ is used to fine-tune the semantic segmentation network and get better weight $\Theta'$.

3.3 The Whole System

In this part, we introduce the whole system. We first download images from Flickr using each of the target category tags. The searched images are associated with the corresponding category tags as the image labels. Since Internet data is very noisy, we filter out images with obviously wrong labels using following three criteria

$$P(G^{Cts}_{n} | I_n; W) \leq 0.1, \quad (13)$$

$G^{Cts}_{n} \notin \text{argsort}(P(I_n; W), \text{‘descent’})[1 : 3], \quad (14)$

$$P(G^{Cts}_{n} | I_n; W) \leq 0.6, \quad (15)$$

in which $I_n$ is an image and its corresponding label is $G^{Cts}_{n}$. Specifically, we train the first classification model on initial data, and filter out noisy images using Eqn.\ (15). The second model is then trained using the remaining data, and Eqn.\ (14) is used to remove wrongly labeled data further. Finally, the third model is trained, and Eqn.\ (15) is applied to obtain the final data that we use in this paper. This simple de-noising procedure works well in our system. Moreover, as the proposed framework is generic and other advanced de-noising methods can be readily applicable.

We train an image classification model using the remaining data, and compute the class-specific attention maps of this model using the algorithm in Section 3.1. The trimap strategy is applied to convert these attention maps into “ground truth” that is used to train a semantic segmentation network \cite{Hed:2010}. The resulting initial model is then fine-tuned using the online optimization algorithm introduced in Section 3.2. As in other semantic segmentation methods, we also consider CRF \cite{aff} as a post-processing step.

4 Experiments

4.1 Implementation Details

We totally download $\sim 970k$ images for the 20 PASCAL VOC categories \cite{Everingham:2010}, each of which has $\sim 48k$ images. After the filtering procedure, there remain $\sim 680k$ images. We randomly select a subset (290k) of the remained images to train the image classification network (GoogleNet \cite{Szegedy:2015}). Then, we
compute the attention maps and train initial segmentation model using the same image set. When training the classification network, we use the recommended settings: base learning rate of 0.02 that is multiplied by 0.96 after every 6.4k steps, momentum of 0.9, weight decay of 0.0004, batch size of 512, and total 32k iterations of SGD. When training the semantic segmentation network [2], we use total SGD iterations of 50k and batch size of 12. Default settings are used for other hyper-parameters. \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta_2 \) are set to 0.5 and 0.65, respectively. Fine-tuning step uses 20k new Internet images as input. \( \mu \) is set to 0.4. All of the data, code, and models used in this paper will be released upon paper acceptance.

We test our system on the \textit{val} and \textit{test} sets of PASCAL VOC2012 [5] dataset, which consists of 1449 validation images and 1456 test images with corresponding carefully annotated segmentation ground truth. In the following sections, we first conduct ablation studies to evaluate different choices of our system, and then compare with other competitors. For the fair comparison, we compare to some weakly supervised semantic segmentation methods [19, 21–23] that only use image-level supervision. The predicted results are evaluated using the standard mean intersection-over-union (mIoU) across all classes.

### 4.2 Ablation Study

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of various design choices of our method on the VOC2012 \textit{val} set. Results are summarized in Table 1. Note that CRF means whether CRF [2] is used as a post-processing step. The improvement from single forward/backward attention maps to fused attention maps demonstrate our observation that forward top attention features and multiscale backward bottom features have useful complementary information. Besides, segment smoothing on the attention maps seems very helpful for the training process, improving mIoU from 28.1 to 36.1. A smoothing operation on the attention maps seems critical to provide a reliable estimation of segmentation ground

#### Table 1: Effects of various design choices of our framework on the PASCAL VOC2012 \textit{val} set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variants</th>
<th>forward</th>
<th>backward</th>
<th>segment</th>
<th>trimap</th>
<th>online fine-tuning</th>
<th>CRF</th>
<th>mIoU (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Comparison with some methods that only use image-level supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>\textit{val} set (mIoU %)</th>
<th>\textit{test} set (mIoU %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With annotated image labels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL-FCN [22]</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL-Base [23]</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL-Base w/ ILP [23]</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-Adapt w/o CRF [19]</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-Adapt [19]</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNN w/o CRF [21]</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNN [21]</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Internet data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-Adapt w/o CRF [19]</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-Adapt [19]</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNN w/o CRF [21]</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNN [21]</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours w/o CRF</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td><strong>39.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effectiveness of segment smooth can also be seen in Figure 1. The online fine-tuning can further improve initial model with 1.9% of mIoU.

4.3 Comparison With Other Competitors

Here, we compare with [19, 21–23] that only use image-level supervision. We report not only the evaluation results of these methods trained with carefully annotated datasets, e.g. PASCAL VOC2012 [5], SBD [6], and ImageNet [4], but also the results of these methods trained with the same noisy Internet data that our method uses. Since only the code of [19, 21] is publicly available, we only report them on our Internet data. Experimental results are displayed in Table 2. We can see that the performances of [19, 21] decrease dramatically from annotated data to Internet data. This shows they are not robust to the noise. Our proposed method achieves the state-of-the-art performance, and even better than [19, 21–23] trained with annotated image labels. Specifically, with Internet data, the mIoU of our method is 23.7% higher than the second best method both on VOC2012 test and val set. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our method on noisy data. Our results can be viewed as a baseline for the future algorithms of Internetly supervised semantic segmentation. A qualitative comparison is displayed in Figure 2.

5 Conclusion

Considering the data shortage problem of deep learning, we propose a possible choice to learn from Internet. Specifically, because annotating pixel-wise labels for semantic segmentation is very expensive and time-consuming, we set up a new problem of Internetly supervised semantic segmentation which aims at automatically learning pixel-wise labeling from Internet without human interaction. To show an example solution for this task, we propose a unified attention model to train an initial model that is improved using a subsequent online fine-tuning algorithm. Our method achieves state-of-the-art performance on VOC2012 dataset [5]. Moreover, the new task, Internetly supervised semantic segmentation, has the potential to obtain semantic segmentation for arbitrary categories freely. Both how to filter out noisy images and how to learn pixel-wise labeling from the noisy data are open problems. More solutions for this task are expected in the future.
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