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## Scalable Multi-Label Annotation



## Multi-label annotation



Task: Crowdsource object labels for images.
Application: Benchmarking, training, modeling Generalization:

- musical attributes of songs
- actions in movies
- sentiments in documents

Current focus:
200 Category Detection
(~100,000 fully labeled images)


## Naïve approach: ask for each object
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## Naïve approach: ask for each object

Cost: O(NK) for N images and K objects


## Hierarchy

## Animal

Furniture
Mammal



## Better approach: exploit label structure
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## Selecting the Right Question

Goal:
Get as much utility (new labels) as possible, for as little cost (worker time) as possible, given a desired level of accuracy

## Accuracy constraint

- User-specified accuracy threshold, e.g., 95\%
- Majority voting assuming uniform worker quality
[GAL: Sheng, Provost, Ipeirotis KDD ‘08]
- Might require only one worker, might require several based on the task


## Cost: worker time (time = money)

expected human time to get an answer with 95\% accuracy

| Question (is there ...) | Cost (second) |
| :--- | :--- |
| a thing used to open cans/bottles | 14.4 |
| an item that runs on electricity (plugged in <br> or using batteries) | 12.6 |
| a stringed instrument | 3.4 |
| a canine | 2.0 |

## Utility: expected \# of new labels



## Utility: expected \# of new labels


utility $=1$


$$
\text { utility }=0.5 * 0+0.5 * 4=2
$$

## Selecting the Right Question

Pick the question with the most labels per second

| Query: Is there a... | Utility <br> (num labels) | Cost <br> (worker time in secs) | Utility-Cost Ratio <br> (labels per sec) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mammal with claws <br> or fingers | 12.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| living organism | 24.8 | 7.9 | 3.1 |
| mammal | 17.6 | 7.4 | 2.4 |
| creature without legs | 5.9 | 2.6 | 2.3 |
| land or avian creature | 20.8 | 9.5 | 2.2 |

## Results

- Dataset: 20K images from ImageNet Challenge 2013.
- Labels: 200 basic categories (dog, cat, table...), 64 internal nodes in hierarchy



## Results

- Dataset: 20K images from ImageNet Challenge 2013.
- Labels: 200 basic categories (dog, cat, table...), 64 internal nodes in hierarchy
- Setup:
- 50-50 training test split
- Estimate parameters on training, simulate on test
- Future work: online estimation


## Results: accuracy

## Annotating 10K images with 200 objects

| Accuracy Threshold <br> per question <br> (parameter) | Accuracy (F1 score) <br> Naïve approach | Accuracy (F1 score) <br> Our approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.95 | $99.64(75.67)$ | $99.75(76.97)$ |
| 0.90 | $99.29(60.17)$ | $99.62(60.69)$ |

## Results: cost

Annotating 10K images with 200 objects

| Accuracy |
| :---: | :---: |
| Threshold per |
| question (parameter) |$\quad$| Cost saving |
| :---: |
| (our approach compared to |
| naïve approach) |

## Results: cost

Annotating 10K images with 200 objects

| Accuracy <br> Threshold per <br> question (parameter) | Cost saving <br> (our approach compared to <br> naïve approach) | 6 times more <br> labels per <br> second |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.95 | $3.93 x$ |  |
| 0.90 | $6.18 x$ |  |

## Conclusions

Speeds up crowdsourced multi-label annotation by exploiting the structure and distribution of labels. Could be a bargain for you!


