P1A-11



Hierarchical Visual Relationship Detection

Xu Sun, Zi Yuan, Tongwei Ren, Jinhui Tang, Gangshan Wu

Introduction Hierarchical visual relationship detection (HVRD) encourages

predictions with abstract yet compatible relationship triplets when the

Contribution: we **firstly** define the HVRD task, propose a novel

HVRD method, and construct two datasets, H-VRD and H-VG, for

confidence level of the specific image content is relatively low.

ACMMULTIMEDIA 2019



	relationship triplets	VRD	HVRD
	<pre>person, stand by, elephant></pre>	correct	1.00
	<person, elephant="" near,=""></person,>	wrong	0.87
	<person, animal="" near,=""></person,>	wrong	0.76
	<entity, entity="" interact,=""></entity,>	wrong	0.15
ha	<person, elephant="" watch,=""> nt></person,>	wrong	0.00

entity

Method

HVRD evaluation.

We propose an order embedding based method to successfully combine visual information and concept structure knowledge, which consists of three components:

- Hierarchical concept embedding: embed concepts in different abstraction levels with order embedding.
- **Hierarchical object detection**: trade off specificity for accuracy with a vision and knowledge joint model.
- Hierarchical predicate detection: combining visual feature and context information.



Experiments

Datasets

We construct two datasets for HVRD evaluation based on VRD and VG datasets, named H-VRD and H-VG.

Qualitative results



<shirt, on, person> <person, near, person> <person, has, hand> <person, wear, glasses>

<shirt, on, perso > (1.00) n, near, person> (1.00) < <person, has, hand> (1.00) <person,wear,spectacles> (0.96)



<shirt, on, person> <person, next to, on> <person, right of, person> <person, on, bench>

<shirt, on, person> (1.00) <person, near, > (0.92) <person, near, person> (0.87) <person, on, seat>(0.96)

the groundtruth relationship triplets

our predicted hierarchical relationship triplets

Evaluation criterion

Recall@N(k=α) adopts a soft judgment strategy to calculate the hit score $s(q_i)$ of each groundtruth relationship instance q_i :

component hit score $\varphi^{S}(g,r) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_{rS}}{d_{gS}}, & r^{S} \in T_{gS}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$

triplet hit score $\varphi(g,r) = \begin{cases} 0, & \varphi^S(g,r) \cdot \varphi^P(g,r) \cdot \varphi^O(g,r) = 0\\ \frac{1}{3}(\varphi^S(g,r) + \varphi^P(g,r) + \varphi^O(g,r)), & otherwise. \end{cases}$

instance hit score $s(g_i) = \max_{r_k \in R_{\alpha_i}} \varphi(g_i, r_k),$

Comparison with the state-of-the-arts

Mathad	HPD			HVRD				
Method	HR@50	HR@100	BR@50	BR@100	HR@50	HR@100	BR@50	BR@100
Lu's	50.32	50.32	50.75	50.75	13.81	14.92	13.84	15.26
VTS	50.08	50.08	50.59	50.59	11.84	13.95	12.04	15.15
DR-net	53.62	53.62	54.02	54.02	14.80	16.90	14.84	17.50
DSR	54.19	54.23	54.71	54.79	14.64	16.82	14.68	17.46
Ours	60.28	60.28	66.20	66.20	15.94	18.66	17.03	19.94
N (1 1	HPD			HVRD				
Method	HR@50	HR@100	BR@50	BR@100	HR@50	HR@100	BR@50	BR@100
VTS	64.44	64.66	65.24	65.47	6.19	8.17	6.21	8.63
DSR	64.27	68.56	65.12	69.47	0.31	0.57	0.32	0.57
Ours	73.89	73.99	76.11	76.25	9.40	11.29	9.77	11.74

Xu Sun: sunx@smail.nju.edu.cn

Tongwei Ren: rentw@nju.edu.cn