Low-Bit Representation of Linear Classifier Weights for Mobile Large-Scale Image Classification Yoshiyuki Kawano and Keiji Yanai PS2 - 36The University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan

Objective

- Implement standalone large-scale object recognition with 1000/10000 classes on a mobile phone.
 - Fisher vector and linear classifier
 - Multi-class classification: one-vs-rest



Implementation



Local descriptors

- RootHOG gradient
- Color moment

local patch: 16x16 and 24x24 dense sampling every 6 pixel

(We are working on DCNN-based mobile object recognition. 4bit is OK currently. We will present it at the other places.)

(D: dim of FV, C:num. of classes)

- Too many training parameters $(D \cdot C)$
- Limited memory and storage

our findings • 2-bit representation of classifier weights led to only slight performance loss.

Standalone mobile obj. rec.

Client-side recognition vs. server-side

- anywhere without internet • Quick response
 - No problem on server scalability

GMM: K=64/128/256 Spatial Pyramid: 1x1 + 2x2 (=5) (K=128 with no SP for 10k classification)

- **Color-FV** (7680d/15360d/30720d)
- **HOG-FV** (10240d/20480d/40960d)

Linear Classifier

AROW (online learning) with 1-vs-rest and late fusion (A linear SVM can be used as an alternative.) Dataset ILSVRC2012(1000), ImageNet 10k

Experimental results

1000-class classification rate with different bits



Until 4-bit, no performance loss. With 2-bit, slight loss. With 1-bit, great loss.

Modification of the way of quantization helps improve performance with 2-bit.

Very-high-dimensional weight vectors still exhibit discriminative power after *low-bit quantization.*

(DCNN has the same characteristics in general.)

For one-vs-rest classification, reconstruction of original weights is not needed.

1bit,256 4bit,64 2bit,128 32bit(float),64 bit numbers, the size of GMM

achieved the best result. However, processing time for feature extraction increased much.

10k-class classification results with 2-bit quantization and Product quantization (PQ) top-1 (%) top-5 (%) memory (Mbyte) method 11.83 25.25 292M no compression 24.30 18.2M 11.42 scalar 23.85 9.1M + 7.3M (PQCB) PQ[3]10.96

10.87

PQ[3] + scalar

Combination of PQ and 2-bit scalar quantization is more effective.

Difference to PQ: PQ needs to refer a codebook table at evaluation time, while the proposed method does not.

[2] Y. Kawano and K. Yanai. ILSVRC on a smartphone. IPSJ Trans. CVA, 6:83–87, 2014.

23.75

[3] H. Jegou, M. Douze, and C. Schmid. Product quantization for nearest neighbor search. IEEE Trans. PAMI, 33(1):117–128, 2011.

9.1M + 1.8M (8bit)