

Google Landmark Retrieval 2021 Competition Third Place Solution

Qishen Ha^{*}
LINE Corp

Bo Liu[†]
NVIDIA

Hongwei Zhang^{*}
LINE Corp

December 22, 2021

Abstract

We present our solutions to the Google Landmark Challenges 2021, for both the retrieval and the recognition tracks. Both solutions are ensembles of transformers and ConvNet models based on Sub-center ArcFace with dynamic margins [7]. Since the two tracks share the same training data, we used the same pipeline and training approach, but with different model selections for the ensemble and different post-processing. The key improvement over last year is newer state-of-the-art vision architectures, especially transformers which significantly outperform ConvNets for the retrieval task. We finished third and fourth places for the retrieval and recognition tracks respectively.

1 Introduction

Google Landmark Challenges have been running for the fourth consecutive year [12]. In the first two iterations, winning solutions used a combination of global and local features, such as 2019’s first place winners in Recognition [6] and Retrieval [14] tracks. But recent fast advances in state-of-the-art ConvNet models, especially EfficientNet [15], resulted in better performance of global feature only models. Neither the first place winner in Retrieval [11] nor Recognition [10] last year used local features.

Last year, the third place team (first two authors of this paper were part of the team) in Recognition introduced Sub-center ArcFace with dynamic margins [7] to tackle the extreme class imbalance in the GLDv2 dataset [17]. It was open sourced and used this year by teams including the first place winner in both tracks [9]. We also used this pipeline for both tracks this year, replacing EfficientNet by newer model architectures. The models are trained the same way for retrieval and recognition. They differ in final model selection for the ensemble and the postprocessing procedure.

^{*}Equal contribution. Alphabetical order.

[†]Corresponding author. Email: boli@nvidia.com

2 Model choices and training recipe

Sub-center ArcFace with dynamic margins [7], an improvement over [4] and [3] was introduced in last year’s recognition competition, and was shown to be effective on the noisy GLDv2 dataset. For both tracks this year, we reuse [7]’s model architectures and training recipe including timm library [18], the same augmentations and the progressive training procedure.

Several state-of-the-art vision model architectures have been proposed in the past year. We replaced EfficientNet backbone by EfficientNetV2 [16], NFNet [1], ViT [5] and Swin Transformer [13] at various model sizes. For transformers, we used a fixed 384 image size. For CNN models, we used progressively larger image sizes ($256 \rightarrow 512 \rightarrow 640$ or 768).

We found that the CNNs and transformers perform equally well on local GAP scores (recognition metric), but transformers have significantly higher local mAP (retrieval metric) even with the smaller 384 image size. We think this is because transformers are patch-based and can capture more local features and their interactions, which are more important for retrieval tasks.

Besides the new models, we also reused some of our last year’s EfficientNet and ReXNet [8] models by finetuning.

3 The Ensemble

The retrieval track ensemble consists of 7 models: 3 transformers, 2 new CNNs and 2 old CNNs. Their specifications and local scores are in Table 1. Note that ViT large and Swin large have slightly worse local recognition scores than NFNet and EffNetV2 but far superior local retrieval scores.

The recognition ensemble has 4 more CNNs, shown in Table 2. Old CNNs’ CV scores are not shown because they are leaky (last year’s fold splits were different).

Model	Image size	Total epochs	Finetune 2020	cv GAP (recognition)	cv mAP@100 (retrieval)
Swin base	384	60		0.7049	0.4442
Swin large	384	60		0.6775	0.5161
ViT large	384	50		0.6589	0.5633
ECA NFNet L2	512	30		0.7021	0.3565
EfficientNet v2l	640	40		0.7129	0.4158
EfficientNet B6	512	10	✓		
EfficientNet B7	672	20	✓		

Table 1: **Retrieval ensemble’s model configuration and local validation scores.** Old CNNs’ CV scores are not shown because they are leaky (last year’s fold splits were different).

For the retrieval ensemble, adding additional CNNs hurt the score. This is because transformers are more important for retrieval, and adding more CNNs would reduce transformers’ relative importance.

4 Postprocessing

As shown repeatedly in previous years, postprocessing by way of adjusting raw cosine similarity scores can greatly improve both the GAP and mAP@100 metrics. For both tracks, we designed postprocessing procedures inspired by previous top solutions. They are tuned on local validation and translate well to the leaderboard.

4.1 Retrieval

For retrieval competition, one needs to predict up to top 100 matching index images for each query image, sorted by decreasing similarity. 2019 Retrieval’s winner used a reranking approach [14] to bump all the “positive” index images to before “negative” index images. The positive and negative are defined as whether the model predict the index image and query image to be the same class. This is a very effective approach, but with some drawbacks: the “positive” and “negative” are predicted by the model hence may be incorrect.

We adopt a softer approach: (1) adjust the similarity scores using a continuous function instead of always bumping positives ahead of negatives, (2) instead of defining positives and negatives using top 1 predictions only, we consider top 3 predictions of both the index image and query image and make adjustments based on the confidence level of the predictions.

Mathematically, the procedure can be represented by these equations:

$$\text{similarity} = \cos(f_q, f_i)$$

$$\text{similarity} += \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 g(j, k) \cdot p_j \cdot q_k, \quad \text{if } c_j = s_k$$

$$\text{similarity} -= \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 h(j, k) \cdot p_j \cdot q_k, \quad \text{if } c_j = s_k$$

where f_q and f_i are query image and index image’s features; c_j is j -th predicted class of the query image and s_k is k -th predicted class of the index image; p_j and q_k are the corresponding confidence scores; $g(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ are rank-based boost function and penalty function respectively, tuned on local validation.

4.2 Recognition

For recognition, we incorporated several ideas of last year’s top 3 solutions

- Combine cosine similarity and classification probabilities (3rd place solution 2020 [7])
- Penalize similarity with non-landmark images (1st place solution 2020 [10])
- Set confidence score of a query image to 0 if its top 5 similarities with non-landmark images are greater than 0.5 (2nd place solution 2020 [2])
- Penalize CosSim(query, index) for the index class’s count in train set (ours, new)

References

- [1] Andrew Brock, Soham De, Samuel L Smith, and Karen Simonyan. High-performance large-scale

Model	Image size	Total epochs	Finetune 2020	cv GAP (recognition)	cv mAP@100 (retrieval)
Swin base	384	60		0.7049	0.4442
Swin large	384	60		0.6775	0.5161
ViT large	384	50		0.6589	0.5633
ECA NFNet L2	640	38		0.7053	0.3600
EfficientNet v2m	640	45		0.7136	0.3811
EfficientNet v2l	512	30		0.7146	0.4117
EfficientNet B4	768	10	✓		
EfficientNet B5	768	20	✓		
EfficientNet B6	512	20	✓		
EfficientNet B7	672	20	✓		
ReXNet 2.0	768	10	✓		

Table 2: **Recognition ensemble’s model configuration and local validation scores.** Old CNNs’ CV scores are not shown because they are leaky (last year’s fold splits were different).

- image recognition without normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.06171*, 2021.
- [2] Shubin Dai. 2nd place solution to google landmark recognition competition 2020. 2020.
- [3] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Tongliang Liu, Mingming Gong, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Sub-center arcface: Boosting face recognition by large-scale noisy web faces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [4] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Niannan Xue, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4690–4699, 2019.
- [5] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [6] Yinzheng Gu and Chuanpeng Li. Team jl solution to google landmark recognition 2019. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11874*, 2019.
- [7] Qishen Ha, Bo Liu, Fuxu Liu, and Peiyuan Liao. Google landmark recognition 2020 competition third place solution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05350*, 2020.
- [8] Dongyoon Han, Sangdoo Yun, Byeongho Heo, and YoungJoon Yoo. ReXNet: Diminishing representational bottleneck on convolutional neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00992*, 2020.
- [9] Christof Henkel. Efficient large-scale image retrieval with deep feature orthogonality and hybrid-swin-transformers. 2021.
- [10] Christof Henkel and Philipp Singer. Supporting large-scale image recognition with out-of-domain samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01650*, 2020.
- [11] SeungKee Jeon. 1st place solution to google landmark retrieval 2020. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05132*, 2020.
- [12] Zu Kim, André Araujo, Bingyi Cao, Cam Askew, Jack Sim, Mike Green, N Yilla, and Tobias Weyand. Towards a fairer landmark recognition dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08874*, 2021.
- [13] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14030*, 2021.
- [14] Kohei Ozaki and Shuhei Yokoo. Large-scale landmark retrieval/recognition under a noisy and diverse dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04087*, 2019.
- [15] Mingxing Tan and Quoc V Le. Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11946*, 2019.
- [16] Mingxing Tan and Quoc V Le. Efficientnetv2: Smaller models and faster training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00298*, 2021.
- [17] T. Weyand, A. Araujo, B. Cao, and J. Sim. Google Landmarks Dataset v2 - A Large-Scale Benchmark for Instance-Level Recognition and Retrieval. In *Proc. CVPR*, 2020.

- [18] Ross Wightman. Pytorch image models.
<https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>,
2019.