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Abstract
Annotated images are required for both supervised model training and evaluation in image classification. Manually annotating images is arduous and expensive, especially for multi-labeled images. A recent trend for conducting such laboursome annotation tasks is through crowdsourcing, where images are annotated by volunteers or paid workers online (e.g., workers of Amazon Mechanical Turk) from scratch. However, the quality of crowdsourcing image annotations cannot be guaranteed, and incompleteness and incorrectness are two major concerns for crowdsourcing annotations. To address such concerns, we have a rethinking of crowdsourcing annotations: Our simple hypothesis is that if the annotators only partially annotate multi-label images with salient labels they are confident in, there will be fewer annotation errors and annotators will spend less time on uncertain labels. As a pleasant surprise, with the same annotation budget, we show a multi-label image classifier supervised by images with salient annotations can outperform models supervised by fully annotated images. Our method contributions are 2-fold: An active learning way is proposed to acquire salient labels for multi-label images; and a novel Adaptive Temperature Associated Model (ATAM) specifically using partial annotations is proposed for multi-label image classification. We conduct experiments on practical crowdsourcing data, the Open Street Map (OSM) dataset and benchmark dataset COCO 2014. When compared with state-of-the-art classification methods trained on fully annotated images, the proposed ATAM can achieve higher accuracy. The proposed idea is promising for crowdsourcing data annotation. Our code will be publicly available.

Introduction
Increasing amount of images has been generated during the last decades. Manually annotating such images is a challenging task. For example, the well-known OpenImages test set will cost $6.5M for precise annotations, and only less than 1% OpenImages data are with annotations. The unannotated data are generally ignored when training a supervised learning model.

Generally, supervised or semi-supervised models trained on more annotated data have better generalization abilities on new data. Efficiently annotating unlabeled data is important, yet difficult, especially for multi-label scenes. Providing clean, multi-label annotations manually for large datasets has long been a challenging task.

A recent trend for image annotations is resorting to crowdsourcing data, such as OpenStreetMap (OSM). OSM is an editable map that is built and annotated by volunteers from scratch. However, the quality of such a manually annotated map may not be satisfying. Incompleteness and incorrectness are two primary concerns, as illustrated in the examples in Fig. 1. Another famous crowdsourcing system is Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), where users (known as Taskmasters) submit their annotations in exchange for small payments. However such annotations may not be reliable.

The quality of annotations could be influenced by two main factors, i.e., the annotator’s reliability (Aydin et al. 2014; Demartini, Difallah, and Cudrè-Mauroux 2012; Karger, Oh, and Shah 2011; Li et al. 2014; Liu et al. 2012a) and the task’s difficulty level (Lakshminarayanan and Teh 2013; Li and Bampis 2017; Li et al. 2020). Reliable anno-
tators will assign the labels seriously, while unreliable ones
could pick the labels carelessly in less than 10 seconds. The
task’s difficulty level is a major reason for label noises in
crowdsourcing data. Since for a crowdsourcing platform,
the annotator’s reliability is hard to control, our rethinking of
crowdsourcing annotation is mainly about the annotation
task itself.

In this paper, we have a rethinking of efficient and trust-
worthy crowdsourcing image annotation. We believe that the
annotators do not need to fully annotate the images with all
labels as in the traditional way. It’s preferred that they par-
tially annotate the images with the most salient labels. An-
notating in this way can save the annotators the trouble of
deciding uncertain labels. As they only annotate the labels
they are confident in, the quality of annotations will be better
and there will be fewer incompleteness/incorrectness cases.

An example of partially annotating the salient labels against
full annotations is shown in Fig. 1. The major contributions
of this paper are as follows:

• We propose a partial crowdsourcing annotation idea. Vol-
unteer/workers are required to annotate the assigned an-
notation budget (e.g., the total number of labels), instead
of annotating the assigned number of images.

• We propose a novel active learning approach for salient
label sampling. We therefore for the first time create the
partially annotated datasets with salient labels.

• We propose a novel partial annotation learning algorithm,
named the Adaptive Temperature Associated Model
(ATAM), for multi-label image classification.

• We experimentally verify that, given the same annota-
tion budget, the proposed classification model trained on
partially annotated images outperforms the model trained
with fully labeled images.

### Related Work

#### Crowdsourcing image annotation

Crowdsourcing services have facilitated scientists in col-
lecting large-scale ground-truth labels (Aydin et al. 2014; Fan et al. 2015). There are many crowdsourcing platforms,
such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, which has recruited more
than 500K workers from 190 countries for annotation tasks
(Zheng et al. 2017; Callison-Burch 2009). However, due to
the openness of crowdsourcing, the annotators may yield
low-quality annotations with noisy labels. Obtaining clean
data with real ground-truth labels from the noisy labels
remains a challenging topic (Davidson et al. 2013; Guo,
Parameswaran, and Garcia-Molina 2012; Venetis et al. 2012;
Zhang, Li, and Feng 2016). Such a crowdsourcing strategy
might have two potential problems. First, different anno-
tators might have different credibility and different back-
grounds. For instance, an experienced annotator is more
likely to provide high-quality annotations than an inex-
perienced annotator. Treating each annotator equally is not a
wise way (Dawid and Skene 1979; Demartini, Difallah, and
Cudré-Mauroux 2012; Li et al. 2014; Liu et al. 2012b; Ma
et al. 2015). Second, most typical crowdsourcing strategies
like Majority Voting strategy are based on repeated anno-
tation by multiple annotators to achieve higher annotation
accuracy, which would be labor-expensive. In this paper, we
provide an alternative way for crowdsourcing image annota-
tions to solve the above problems: The annotators only need
to partially assign the salient labels to images which they are
most confident in. In this way, fewer annotators are needed
for each task, and annotators are more likely to provide high-
quality annotations.

#### Partial multi-label learning (PML)

Multi-label learning has been an active research topic of
practical importance, since images collected in the wild are
often with more than one label (Tsoumakas and Katakis
2007). The conventional multi-label learning research (Beh-
pour 2018; Lyu, Feng, and Li 2020; Wang, Ding, and Fu
2018) mainly relies on the assumption that a small subset of
images with full labels are available for training. However,
such an assumption is difficult to satisfy in practice, as man-
ually yielded annotations always suffer from incomplete and
incorrect annotation problems, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Such
label concerns are especially serious for data annotated in a
crowdsourcing way.

It would be much easier if crowdsourcing annotation is
only partial. With the emerging area of partial multi-label
learning, it becomes possible for researchers to learn a multi-
label classification model from such ambiguous data (Xie
and Huang 2020; Sun et al. 2019; Zhang, Yu, and Tang
2017). Traditional methods treat missing labels as negatives
during the model training process (Mahajan et al. 2018; Bu-
cak, Jin, and Jain 2011; Sun et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2014;
Joulin et al. 2016), while it could still lead to classification
performance degradation. To mitigate this problem, a novel
approach for partial multi-label learning treats missing la-
bel concerns as hidden variables. However, the above models
were mainly for small datasets. In this paper, we propose a
novel image classification model from such ambiguous data
(Vasishth et al. 2014; Chu, Yeh, and Wang 2018). Differently, the work in
Misra et al. 2016) treats missing labels as negatives, and
then corrects the induced errors by learning a transformation
on the output of the multi-label classifier. However, scaling
the above models to large datasets is not easy (Deng et al.
2014; Huynh and Elhamifar 2018). Another recent trend for
partial multi-label learning can be found in (Win Li. and
Zhou 2018; Liu, Jin, and Yang 2018; Feng and An 2018),
which introduces curriculum learning and bootstrapping to
increase the number of annotations. During the model train-
ing, this approach uses the partially annotated data and the
unannotated data whose the classifier is most confi-
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For a deep network budget $L$, if the volume of annotation set $N$, a new subset $N_{t}$ of samples will be actively annotated, and their annotations will be added to the current annotation set $Y_{t}$. The current annotated data will be further used to fine-tune the backbone network, which will be used for salient label querying in the next iteration. The query process will continue until the volume of the current annotation set $Y_{t}$ reaches $L_{b}$. The detailed procedure is defined in Alg. 1. The data will be sampled and annotated iteratively in this querying-labeling way. Our goal is to generate the final annotation set $Y_{K}$ (equals to $Y_{t}$). Note that during this active learning process, we will ensure for each image at least one positive label is assigned.

Adaptive Temperature Associated Model

To tackle the problem of efficiently utilizing the annotation budget, we proposed a novel algorithm, named the Adaptive Temperature Associated Model (ATAM), for multi-label image classification using partially annotated data. The general flowchart of the proposed model is illustrated in Fig. 2. The framework consists of two main branches: the Multi-label Learning (MLL) branch and Unknown Label Prediction (ULP) branch.

Algorithm 1: Active learning for annotation sampling

1: Given: $X_{0}$ with annotation $Y_{0}$, the number of annotations $N_{t}$ in iteration $t$, and the annotation budget $L_{b}$.
2: Initialize the pretrained network with parameter $\theta$ fine-tuned by $Y_{0}$.
3: while $L_{b} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{t} L_{n}$ do
4: \quad $Y_{n}^{u} = f(x; \theta)_{i=1}^{N}$
5: \quad annotate labels in $Y_{n}^{u}$ and update the $Y_{n}$ with Eq. (1).
6: \quad Get the current number of known labels $\sum_{n=1}^{t} L_{n}$.
7: \quad Optimize $\theta$ with $Y_{i}$.
8: end while

Data Preparation

This section employs the active learning way to prepare the salient labels for partially annotated multi-label images.

We want to first make clear that partial annotation includes both known and unknown labels (compared with full annotations) at the image level. While at the dataset level, the partially annotated data are used as training data.

Given a training dataset with partial annotation \{(x_{i}, y_{i}^{k}, y_{i}^{u})\}_{i=1}^{N}$. $y_{i}^{k}$ and $y_{i}^{u}$ denote the known labels and the unknown labels of the input image $x_{i}$. Note that the total number of training images $N$ is not a constant. Only if the volume of annotation set $Y_{K}$ reaches the annotation budget $L_{b}$, the annotation process will stop. Suppose we have $C$ categories and $c \in C$ represents a specific category. For a deep network $f(\theta)$ (\theta is the network parameters), the predicted annotation $y_{i}^{c} = f(x_{i}; \theta)$, $y_{i}^{c} \in \{1, -1, 0\}$ stands for \{positive, negative, and unknown\} of the category $c$ respectively. $Y_{k}$ and $Y_{u}$ represent the known label set and the unknown label set.

For the data preparation, we first annotate 50 images with salient labels, represented by $X_{0}$. We use these annotated samples to fine-tune the backbone network (ResNet, as in Fig. 2), which is pre-trained on ImageNet training Dataset already. Then iteratively, we input another 50 samples to the fine-tuned network and select the labels with the highest prediction confidence to annotate. We assume these labels salient labels which are also easiest to recognize to annotators. We further formulate this querying step as:

$$Y_{t} = Y_{t-1} \cup \{f(x_{i}; \theta) \geq S\}_{i=1}^{N_{t}}$$

where $S$ is the confidence of a specific class exists (for positive labels)/not exists (for negative labels) in sample $i$. We use this parameter for controlling the learning speed of active learning, as the number of labels to annotate in one iteration depends on the value of $S$. We empirically set it as 0.8. At the querying step $t$, a new subset $N_{t}$ (50) of samples will be actively annotated, and their annotations will be added to the current annotation set $Y_{t}$. The current annotated data will be further used to fine-tune the backbone network, which will be used for salient label querying in the next iteration. The query process will continue until the volume of the current annotation set $Y_{t}$ reaches $L_{b}$. The detailed procedure is defined in Alg. 1. The data will be sampled and annotated iteratively in this querying-labeling way. Our goal is to generate the final annotation set $Y_{K}$ (equals to $Y_{t}$). Note that during this active learning process, we will ensure for each image at least one positive label is assigned.

Figure 2: The training model structure of the proposed ATAM framework. The framework uses ResNet as the backbone. The ATAM mainly includes two branches, the Multi-label Learning (MLL) branch and the Unknown Label Prediction (ULP) branch. The MLL has two main modules, the feature representation learning (FRLM) module and the category representation learning (CRLM) module. Here $wLoss$ is the weighted loss in Eq. (7), and $T$ is the smoothing factor.
Multi-Label learning (MLL)

For the multi-label learning branch, the goal of this branch is to optimize the framework using the annotations \( \{Y_k + Y_s\} \) of the current step, where \( Y_k \) is the initial known labels and \( Y_s \) is the predicted labels generated by the ULP branch. The MLL branch consists of two modules: the feature representation learning module (FRLM) and the category representation learning module (CRLM). The FRLM module is used to extract the features of the input image \( x_i \), which is a regular CNN as in Fig. 2. The CRLM module is introduced to integrate the category information into classification. The general operation routine of the procedure is as follows: A \( 2048 \times 1 \) feature vector of the input data \( x_i \) is first extracted by the FRLM module and fed into two fully connected (FC) layers. Then the output feature vector and the output of GCN(\( \alpha \times 1024 \times C \) matrix) are fed to a scalar product layer, whose output is denoted as \( z_i \), \( z_i \) will be the input for the final activation layer \( \sigma \), after which we will get the final predicted labels \( y_i \).

Category representation learning with GCN

In multi-label classification, inner correlations between the categories contain important information. To model the category level representation, a Graph Convolution Network (GCN) is introduced. GCN is intended to solve the problem under a non-Euclidean topological graph. Given a graph \( \mathcal{G}(V, E) \) with node features and edge features, where \( V \) defines a set of nodes, \( E \) is a set of edges. For the input of the category representation learning module, GloVe (Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014) is used to generate the category vectors. The computation graph is generated based on the feature embedding of each node and its neighbors. We follow a common practice to deploy GCN layers:

\[
H^{l+1} = \sigma(\hat{A}H^lW^l), \quad (2)
\]

where \( H^l \) is the hidden representation describing the node’s state at layer \( l \) for the input \( x_i \), \( \hat{A} \) is the normalized correlation matrix, \( W \) is a learnable transformation matrix, and \( \sigma \) acts as a non-linear function where we employ LeakyReLU to implement this operation. The correlation matrix \( \hat{A} \) here represents the co-occurrence of each two labels. For example, if one sample include both label \( i \) and \( j \), then \( A_{i,j} \) increase by 1. The final \( A \) will be normalized and we will get \( \hat{A} \).

Temperature Integrated ULP

The problem we tackle in the Unknown Label Prediction (ULP) branch is to assign full annotation to the partially annotated training samples, under the limitation of the annotation budget. To be more specific, ULP branch will generate \( Y_s \) as the output \( Y_s \) at the very beginning is not valid enough; Second, there must be some difficult labels whose occurrence possibilities will always stay in \([1-\beta, \beta]\), which means we cannot classify them as positive or negative. Inspired by the knowledge distillation idea, we propose to introduce the temperature concept to sharpen/soften the invalid/difficult label predictions. To be more specific, we introduce a temperature factor \( T \) to the sigmoid function. Integrated with the temperature factor \( T \), for a random sample \( i \) and category \( c \) the sigmoid function (activation) could be defined as

\[
\sigma'(z_i^c, T^c_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-z_i^c/T^c_i)}, \quad (4)
\]

\( z \) is the input of the activation layer in the neural network, which is the dot product between outputs of CRLM and FRLM. To calculate the \( T \), we will introduce the edge weight in GCN as in the previous section.

We assume that an unknown label \( m \) should be difficult labels if its connection \( E_{m,1}, E_{m,2}, \ldots, E_{m,n} \) (suppose we have \( n \) known labels) with all known labels are small, which means CRLM cannot help with the prediction. Then we will sharpen the prediction. If the connection between \( E_{m,k} \) and a random known label \( k \) is too large, then the prediction relies heavily on CRLM, which means the \( m \) might have the same annotation with the \( k \), and invalid prediction might be given at the very beginning of model training. Then we need to soften this prediction. We can also understand this assumption as we want to use the \( T \) to better balance the effectiveness of CRLM and FRLM. Therefore, we define \( T \) as:

\[
T^m_i = \alpha \cdot \text{STD}(E_{m,j}) \cdot \exp(-z_i^m/T^m_i), \quad (5)
\]

where STD means the standard deviation and \( \alpha \) is a hyper-parameter for controlling the overall smoothing level and is empirically set to be 10. A visualized function of \( T \) can be found in Fig. 3. We also want to point out that we set the
maximum training epochs of ULP as 50. After 50 epochs, there are still a few difficult labels (1%-2%). We find the annotations of such difficult labels do not make a big difference for the following model training, and we set all these labels as negative labels.

### Weighted focal loss and label smoothing

An inherent problem for multi-label classification is label imbalance. There are much fewer positive samples than the negative samples. To overcome this problem, we use the weighted focal loss (wFL) instead of the regular binary cross entropy loss for the optimization of the proposed model, which is formulated as:

\[
L_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_{\beta}(\alpha y_i^k (1 - \sigma(\cdot))^{\gamma} \log \sigma(\cdot)) + (1 - \alpha)(1 - y_i^k)\gamma \sigma(\cdot) \log(1 - \sigma(\cdot)),
\]

where \(p_{\beta}\) is the proportion of class-wise samples with respect to all the data in the dataset and fulfills \(p_{\beta} \in (0, 1)\) and \(\sum_{k=1}^{C} p_{\beta} = 1\). \(\alpha\) and \(\gamma\) here are empirically set as 0.25 and 2 respectively, as demonstrated in (Lin et al. 2017).

To calculate the loss \(L_s\) for the predicted labels \(Y_s\) \((Y_s\) is also taken as ground truth in the later stage of training), we introduce the smoothing factor \(T\) to the activation function \(\sigma\). By changing the \(\sigma\) in Eq. 6 to \(\sigma\), we can get the \(L_s\).

We further use a hyper-parameter \(\epsilon\) to control the ratio of \(L_k\) and \(L_s\), we give higher priority to \(Y_k\) and \(\epsilon\) is empirically set as 0.5. The final loss for training is formulated as follows:

\[
L_w = L_k + \epsilon L_s.
\]

### Model training

Note that ULP branch is not trainable, as the only variable \(T\) in ULP depends on the GCN part in MLL branch. The training is for the MLL branch. After getting the known label set \(Y_k\) using active learning, as described in Section 3, (step-1) we firstly use the known labels \((x_i, y_i^k)\) to train the MLL branch by minimizing the loss function \(L_k\) until we get the first predicted annotations \(Y_s\) (around 10 epochs). Secondly, (step-2) with the optimized MLL branch we get the new label predictions. We use the Eq. 5 to get the predicted annotations \(Y_s\) and extend the training annotations to \((Y_K \cup Y_s)\). Thirdly (step-3), the MLL branch is further optimized by minimizing \(L_w\) using the updated training dataset \((Y_K \cup Y_s)\). By repeating step-2 and step-3, the annotations of all categories will be acquired gradually, and the network parameter \(\theta\) for the MLL branch will be optimized. After around 50 epochs, all labels for training data are acquired, and ULP branch will be removed. The following training is just regular network training for the MLL branch until convergence. For the model testing, we also only use the MLL branch to give out the multi-label prediction of each testing sample. A pseudo-code for model training can be found in the supplementary material.
For performance evaluation, we report the average overall precision (OP), overall recall (OR), F1-score (OF1), F2-score (OF2).

Performance comparison

In this section, we conduct several experiments to explore the best strategy to utilize the annotations with a specific budget. For each experiment, the annotation budget is the same among different methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OF1</th>
<th>OF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TresNet-ASL</td>
<td>0.5700</td>
<td>0.3701</td>
<td>0.4488</td>
<td>0.3980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML-GCN</td>
<td>0.4620</td>
<td>0.4034</td>
<td>0.4307</td>
<td>0.4139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSSNet</td>
<td>0.4704</td>
<td>0.3622</td>
<td>0.4093</td>
<td>0.3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM</td>
<td>0.6826</td>
<td>0.4567</td>
<td>0.5472</td>
<td>0.4891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM(40-full)</td>
<td>0.5044</td>
<td>0.3723</td>
<td>0.4284</td>
<td>0.3929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM(100-full)</td>
<td>0.7331</td>
<td>0.4850</td>
<td>0.5838</td>
<td>0.5202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Classification accuracy comparisons with SOTA methods (i.e., TresNet-ASL [Ben-Baruch et al. 2020], ML-GCN [Chen et al. 2019], KSSNet [Wang et al. 2020]) and different annotation strategies.

40% training data with full annotations vs all training data with 40% partial annotations. In this experiment, three most recently proposed well-known multi-label classification algorithms, TresNet-448 (Ben-Baruch et al. 2020), ML-GCN (Chen et al. 2019), and KSSNet (Wang et al. 2020), are used for comparison. As these SOTA methods do not have a missing label prediction module, they can only be trained with fully annotated data. For our ATAM method, we use partially annotated data for training. All comparison methods have the same amount of annotation budget for model training. To be more specific, during the implementation, we use 40% partial annotations of training data to complete our experiments. We will also compare the influence of different proportions in the following sections.

The results are shown in Table 1. With the same annotation budget, the proposed method outperforms other multi-label methods. The reason for the better performance is that with a fixed annotation budget, the partial annotation method could access 2.5 times the number of images compared with fully annotated data.

With the training process going on, the proposed method is able to predict missing labels step by step and further use the extended annotations to optimize the model. As can be found in Table 1, the proposed method using partial annotations can achieve much higher accuracy than comparative methods using the fully annotated option.

Full vs partial annotations. We also use fully annotated data with the same annotation budget for the proposed ATAM method, to more specifically verify the effectiveness of partial annotation. Results can be found in Table 1. We can find that with the same annotation budget, the partial annotation way significantly outperforms the full annotation way (ATAM(40-full)). Furthermore, we use a full annotation budget (100% labels) instead of 40% to make a comparison with our partial method. Under such a scenario, the inputs of both methods are all the training images. We can find that compared with training on the whole dataset with full annotations (ATAM(100-full)), our classification accuracy only slightly degrades, though it saves 60% annotation budget.

Simulation for data with incorrect labels. In this section, we only use partially annotated data. We want to investigate if wrong labels exist, how accuracy changes. We assign all missing labels as negative values, the same as the crowdsourcing process, which generally takes these unannotated labels as negatives. This is also a common strategy for multi-label classification methods with missing labels. The same setting goes for both the proposed and the comparison methods. The comparison results are shown in Table 2.

For SOTA methods, compared with using less but fully annotated images as in Table 1, the corresponding F1-score and F2-score degrade significantly. One main reason lies in the fact that there are quite many positive labels in the missing labels. Assigning missing annotations with negative val-
ues will introduce too much noise to the training dataset. Also, it exacerbates the data imbalance problem of the multi-label dataset, as we mentioned before.

Effects of salient sampling

In this section, we investigate the effect of active learning based on salient label sampling. In the labeling process, people always tend to provide annotations to those ‘easy’ salient objects, especially when there is no restriction on which categories must be annotated. We want to verify the effectiveness of the salient annotation way, and we compare this way and the random annotation way in this section. Salient annotation is realized through active learning, as mentioned in the data preparation section. For random sampling, 40% annotations are chosen randomly, including both positive and negative labels. For each sampled image, at least one positive label is chosen to avoid the annotated labels being all negative. For active learning, the initial 50 images use the same strategy as the random sampling; a querying-labeling way is applied to generate the rest labels.

Figure 7: Random annotation versus salient annotation.

As shown in Fig. 7, salient sampling can not only accelerate the convergence speed but generates better performance compared with random sampling as well. In other words, initializing the annotations properly could help the framework to work much more efficiently.

Effect of label proportion

We explore the effect of the proportion of known labels on the performance of the proposed method on the OSM-AID dataset. As shown in Fig. 8 with the label proportion increase from 40 to 80 percentages, the F1-score increases from 0.5472 to 0.5801 and F2-score increases from 0.4891 to 0.5197. With a lower annotation budget, the proposed method could get a comparable accuracy as training with fully annotated data. We can conclude that annotation proportion around 50% should be preferred, as the labor wasted on more annotations cannot generate a correspondingly large increase in classification accuracy.

More Experiments on Benchmark Dataset

As there’s no existing benchmark partially labeled multi-label data, instead, we use the multi-label data Coco 2014. We want to further verify our proposed idea on a real scenario when there are absent labels.

COCO2014: is mostly used in objection detection, containing 80 categories in total, 82,081 images for training, and 40,504 images for validation and testing. As the dataset is not specifically for multi-label classification, the average number of categories in one image is only 3.5. With only 40% budget, it is hard to generate a partial annotation dataset fairly for different methods. So we randomly choose 60% labels (including originally negative ones) as missing labels and set them as ‘negative’. We use this way to simulate the crowdsourcing data with noise (incorrect labels). We can find the performance superiority of our proposed method in 3. This observation also shows the proposed framework is more robust when incorrect labels exist.

Table 3: Coco 2014: Accuracy performance comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method(N-ML)</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OP1</th>
<th>OP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TresNet-ASL</td>
<td>0.5976</td>
<td>0.2917</td>
<td>0.3920</td>
<td>0.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML-GCN</td>
<td>0.5139</td>
<td>0.2236</td>
<td>0.3116</td>
<td>0.2521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSSNet</td>
<td>0.4696</td>
<td>0.2153</td>
<td>0.2952</td>
<td>0.2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM</td>
<td>0.7853</td>
<td>0.5978</td>
<td>0.6788</td>
<td>0.6278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

In this paper, inspired by our observation that partially annotating the crowdsourcing images with salient labels can decrease the annotation task difficulty and increase the annotator’s reliability, we propose a novel way for crowdsourcing image annotation. We also propose a novel framework for multi-label image classification using partially annotated images. The proposed Adaptive Temperature Associated Model can utilize the annotations more efficiently. In the experimental part, we demonstrate that, with the same annotation budget, the classification model trained with partially annotated data can yield better performance. We will extend the proposed annotation framework to more challenging image types and learning tasks in future work.
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