A Fuller Understanding of Fully Convolutional Networks



Evan Shelhamer* Jonathan Long* Trevor Darrell UC Berkeley in CVPR'15, PAMI'16

pixels in, pixels out

colorization Zhang et al.2016







monocular depth + normals Eigen & Fergus 2015







optical flow Fischer et al. 2015





boundary prediction Xie & Tu 2015 2

convnets perform classification





"tabby cat"

1000-dim vector

lots of pixels, little time?







end-to-end learning

a classification network



 $227\times227 \quad 55\times55 \quad 27\times27 \qquad 13\times13$

becoming fully convolutional



becoming fully convolutional

convolution



7

upsampling output



end-to-end, pixels-to-pixels network



end-to-end, pixels-to-pixels network



spectrum of deep features

combine where (local, shallow) with what (global, deep)

image



intermediate layers









fuse features into deep jet

(cf. Hariharan et al. CVPR15 "hypercolumn")

skip layers



skip layer refinement



1 skip

no skips

skip FCN computation





A multi-stream network that fuses features/predictions across layers



Relative to prior state-of-the-art SDS:

- 30% relative improvement for mean IoU
- 286× faster

| | | mean | aero plane | bicycle | bird | boat | bottle | bus | car | cat | chair | COW | dining table | dog | horse | motor bike | person | potted plant | sheep | sofa | train | tv/ monitor | submission date |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | | \bigtriangledown |
| \triangleright | MSRA_BoxSup [?] | FCN 75.2 | 89.8 | 38.0 | 89.2 | 68.9 | 68.0 | 89.6 | 83.0 | 87.7 | 34.4 | 83.6 | 67.1 | 81.5 | 83.7 | 85.2 | 83.5 | 58.6 | 84.9 | 55.8 | 81.2 | 70.7 | 18-May-2015 |
| \triangleright | Oxford_TVG_CRF_RNN_COCO [?] | FCN 74.7 | 90.4 | 55.3 | 88.7 | 68.4 | 69.8 | 88.3 | 82.4 | 85.1 | 32.6 | 78.5 | 64.4 | 79.6 | 81.9 | 86.4 | 81.8 | 58.6 | 82.4 | 53.5 | 77.4 | 70.1 | 22-Apr-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-MSc-CRF-LargeFOV-COCO-CrossJo | FCN 73.9 | 89.2 | 46.7 | 88.5 | 63.5 | 68.4 | 87.0 | 81.2 | 86.3 | 32.6 | 80.7 | 62.4 | 81.0 | 81.3 | 84.3 | 82.1 | 56.2 | 84.6 | 58.3 | 76.2 | 67.2 | 26-Apr-2015 |
| \triangleright | Adelaide_Context_CNN_CRF_VOC [?] | FCN 72.9 | 89.7 | 37.6 | 77.4 | 62.1 | 72.9 | 88.1 | 84.8 | 81.9 | 34.4 | 80.0 | 55.9 | 79.3 | 82.3 | 84.0 | 82.9 | 59.7 | 82.8 | 54.1 | 77.5 | 70.3 | 25-May-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-CRF-COCO-LargeFOV [?] | FCN 72.7 | 89.1 | 38.3 | 88.1 | 63.3 | 69.7 | 87.1 | 83.1 | 85.0 | 29.3 | 76.5 | 56.5 | 79.8 | 77.9 | 85.8 | 82.4 | 57.4 | 84.3 | 54.9 | 80.5 | 64.1 | 18-Mar-2015 |
| \triangleright | POSTECH_EDeconvNet_CRF_VOC [?] | FCN 72.5 | 89.9 | 39.3 | 79.7 | 63.9 | 68.2 | 87.4 | 81.2 | 86.1 | 28.5 | 77.0 | 62.0 | 79.0 | 80.3 | 83.6 | 80.2 | 58.8 | 83.4 | 54.3 | 80.7 | 65.0 | 22-Apr-2015 |
| \triangleright | Oxford_TVG_CRF_RNN_VOC [?] | FCN 72.0 | 87.5 | 39.0 | 79.7 | 64.2 | 68.3 | 87.6 | 80.8 | 84.4 | 30.4 | 78.2 | 60.4 | 80.5 | 77.8 | 83.1 | 80.6 | 59.5 | 82.8 | 47.8 | 78.3 | 67.1 | 22-Apr-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-MSc-CRF-LargeFOV [?] | FCN 71.6 | 84.4 | 54.5 | 81.5 | 63.6 | 65.9 | 85.1 | 79.1 | 83.4 | 30.7 | 74.1 | 59.8 | 79.0 | 76.1 | 83.2 | 80.8 | 59.7 | 82.2 | 50.4 | 73.1 | 63.7 | 02-Apr-2015 |
| \triangleright | MSRA_BoxSup ^[?] | FCN 71.0 | 86.4 | 35.5 | 79.7 | 65.2 | 65.2 | 84.3 | 78.5 | 83.7 | 30.5 | 76.2 | 62.6 | 79.3 | 76.1 | 82.1 | 81.3 | 57.0 | 78.2 | 55.0 | 72.5 | 68.1 | 10-Feb-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-CRF-COCO-Strong [?] | FCN 70.4 | 85.3 | 36.2 | 84.8 | 61.2 | 67.5 | 84.6 | 81.4 | 81.0 | 30.8 | 73.8 | 53.8 | 77.5 | 76.5 | 82.3 | 81.6 | 56.3 | 78.9 | 52.3 | 76.6 | 63.3 | 11-Feb-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-CRF-LargeFOV [?] | FCN 70.3 | 83.5 | 36.6 | 82.5 | 9 | 6t 5 | 854 | 785 | 134 | 304 | 729 | 21 | Ъ. | 75 5 | 82. | ∧/ •ľ | 8.2 | 8.0 | 48.8 | 28.7 | T 63. | 28-Mar-2015 |
| \triangleright | TTI_zoomout_v2 [?] | 69.6 | 85.6 | 37.3 | 83.2 | 62.5 | 00.0 | o5 1 | 80.7 | 84.9 | 27.2 | 73.Z | 57.5 | 78.1 | 79.2 | 81.1 | 77.1 | 53.6 | 74.0 | 49.2 | 71.7 | 65.3 | 30-Mar-2015 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-CRF-MSc [?] | FCN 67.1 | 80.4 | 36.8 | 77.4 | 55.2 | 66.4 | 81.5 | 77.5 | 78.9 | 27.1 | 68.2 | 52.7 | 74.3 | 69.6 | 79.4 | 79.0 | 56.9 | 78.8 | 45.2 | 72.7 | 59.3 | 30-Dec-2014 |
| \triangleright | DeepLab-CRF [?] | FCN 66.4 | 78.4 | 33.1 | 78.2 | 55.6 | 65.3 | 81.3 | 75.5 | 78.6 | 25.3 | 69.2 | 52.7 | 75.2 | 69.0 | 79.1 | 77.6 | 54.7 | 78.3 | 45.1 | 73.3 | 56.2 | 23-Dec-2014 |
| \triangleright | CRF_RNN ^[?] | FCN 65.2 | 80.9 | 34.0 | 72.9 | 52.6 | 62.5 | 79.8 | 76.3 | 79.9 | 23.6 | 67.7 | 51.8 | 74.8 | 69.9 | 76.9 | 76.9 | 49.0 | 74.7 | 42.7 | 72.1 | 59.6 | 10-Feb-2015 |
| \triangleright | TTI_zoomout_16 [?] | 64.4 | 81.9 | 35.1 | 78.2 | 57.4 | 56.5 | 80.5 | 74.0 | 79.8 | 22.4 | 69.6 | 53.7 | 74.0 | 76.0 | 76.6 | 68.8 | 44.3 | 70.2 | 40.2 | 68.9 | 55.3 | 24-Nov-2014 |
| \triangleright | Hypercolumn [?] | 62.6 | 68.7 | 33.5 | 69.8 | 51.3 | 70.2 | 81.1 | 71.9 | 74.9 | 23.9 | 60.6 | 46.9 | 72.1 | 68.3 | 74.5 | 72.9 | 52.6 | 64.4 | 45.4 | 64.9 | 57.4 | 09-Apr-2015 |
| | FCN-8s ^[?] | FCN 62.2 | 76.8 | 34.2 | 68.9 | 49.4 | 60.3 | 75.3 | 74.7 | 77.6 | 21.4 | 62.5 | 46.8 | 71.8 | 63.9 | 76.5 | 73.9 | 45.2 | 72.4 | 37.4 | 70.9 | 55.1 | 12-Nov-2014 |
| \triangleright | MSRA_CFM ^[?] | 61.8 | 75.7 | 26.7 | 69.5 | 48.8 | 65.6 | 81.0 | 69.2 | 73.3 | 30.0 | 68.7 | 51.5 | 69.1 | 68.1 | 71.7 | 67.5 | 50.4 | 66.5 | 44.4 | 58.9 | 53.5 | 17-Dec-2014 |
| \triangleright | TTI_zoomout ^[?] | 58.4 | 70.3 | 31.9 | 68.3 | 46.4 | 52.1 | 75.3 | 68.4 | 75.3 | 19.2 | 58.4 | 49.9 | 69.6 | 63.0 | 70.1 | 67.6 | 41.5 | 64.0 | 34.9 | 64.2 | 47.3 | 17-Nov-2014 |
| \triangleright | SDS [?] | 51.6 | 63.3 | 25.7 | 63.0 | 39.8 | 59.2 | 70.9 | 61.4 | 54.9 | 16.8 | 45.0 | 48.2 | 50.5 | 51.0 | 57.7 | 63.3 | 31.8 | 58.7 | 31.2 | 55.7 | 48.5 | 21-Jul-2014 |
| \triangleright | NUS_UDS [?] | 50.0 | | 24.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 53.1 | | 29-Oct-2014 |
| \triangleright | TTIC-divmbest-rerank [?] | 48.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \triangleright | BONN_O2PCPMC_FGT_SEGM [?] | 47.8 | | | 54.1 | | | | | | | | 29.6 | | | | | | | | 48.4 | | |
| \triangleright | BONN_02PCPMC_FGT_SEGM [?] | 47.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \triangleright | BONNGC_02P_CPMC_CSI [?] | 46.8 | | 26.8 | | | 47.1 | | | 55.1 | | | | | | | 53.4 | | | | | | 23-Sep-2012 |
| \triangleright | BONN_CMBR_O2P_CPMC_LIN [?] | 46.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 23-Sep12612 |



care and feeding of fully convolutional networks

usage

- train full image at a time *without sampling*
- reshape network to take input of any size
- forward time is ~100ms for 500 x 500 x 21 output (on M. Titan X)

image-to-image optimization

| | batch | m o m | pixel | mean | mean | f.w. |
|------------|-------|---------------------|-------|------|------|------|
| | size | mom. | acc. | acc. | 10 | 10 |
| FCN-accum | 20 | 0.9 | 86.0 | 66.5 | 51.9 | 76.5 |
| FCN-online | 1 | 0.9 | 89.3 | 76.2 | 60.7 | 81.8 |
| FCN-heavy | 1 | 0.99 | 90.5 | 76.5 | 63.6 | 83.5 |

momentum and batch size



momentum p and batch size k

$$p^{(1/k)} = p^{\prime(1/k')}$$

$$g_t = -\eta \sum_{i=0}^{k-1}
abla_ heta \ell(x_{kt+i}; heta_{t-1}) + pg_{t-1} \ \infty \ _{k-1}$$

$$g_t = -\eta \sum_{s=0} \sum_{i=0} p^s
abla_ heta \ell(x_{k(t-s)+i}; heta_{t-s}))$$

sampling images?

no need! no improvement from sampling across images



sampling pixels?

no need! no improvement from (partially) decorrelating pixels





uniform

poisson

context?

- do FCNs incorporate contextual cues?
- loses 3-4 % points when the background is masked
- can learn from BG/shape alone if forced to!
 - Standard 85 IU
 - BG alone 38 IU
 - Shape 29 IU



past and future history of fully convolutional networks

history



Shape Displacement Network Matan & LeCun 1992 Convolutional Locator Network Wolf & Platt 1994

pyramids



Scale Pyramid, Burt & Adelson '83

The scale pyramid is a classic multi-resolution representation

Fusing multi-resolution network layers is a learned, nonlinear counterpart

jets



The local jet collects the partial derivatives at a point for a rich local description

The deep jet collects layer compositions for a rich, learned description

extensions

- detection + instances
- structured output
- weak supervision

detection: fully conv. proposals



Fast R-CNN, Girshick ICCV'15



Faster R-CNN, Ren et al. NIPS'15

end-to-end detection by proposal FCN Rol classification

fully conv. nets + structured output



Semantic Image Segmentation with Deep Convolutional Nets and Fully Connected CRFs. Chen* & Papandreou* et al. ICLR 2015.

fully conv. nets + structured output



| Method | Without COCO | With COCO | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Plain FCN-8s | 61.3 | 68.3 | | | |
| FCN-8s and CRF disconnected | 63.7 | 69.5 | | | |
| End-to-end training of CRF-RNN | 69.6 | 72.9 | | | |

Conditional Random Fields as Recurrent Neural Networks. *Zheng* & Jayasumana* et al.* ICCV 2015.

dilation for structured output



- enlarge effective receptive field for same no. params
- raise resolution
- convolutional context model: similar accuracy to CRF but non-probabilistic

Multi-Scale Context Aggregation by Dilated Convolutions. Yu & Koltun. ICLR 2016



[comparison credit: CRF as RNN, Zheng* & Jayasumana* et al. ICCV 2015]

DeepLab: Chen* & Papandreou* et al. ICLR 2015. CRF-RNN: Zheng* & Jayasumana* et al. ICCV 2015

fully conv. nets + weak supervision

FCNs expose a spatial loss map to guide learning: segment from tags by MIL or pixelwise constraints



Constrained Convolutional Neural Networks for Weakly Supervised Segmentation. Pathak et al. arXiv 2015.

fully conv. nets + weak supervision

FCNs expose a spatial loss map to guide learning: mine boxes + feedback to refine masks



BoxSup: Exploiting Bounding Boxes to Supervise Convolutional Networks for Semantic Segmentation. Dai et al. 2015.

fully conv. nets + weak supervision

FCNs can learn from sparse annotations == sampling the loss

Original image

Image-level labels



1 point per class



Levels of supervision



What's the Point? Semantic Segmentation with Point Supervision. *Bearman et al.* ECCV 2016.

conclusion

fully convolutional networks are fast, end-to-end models for pixelwise problems

- code in Caffe
- models for PASCAL VOC, NYUDv2, SIFT Flow, PASCAL-Context



caffe.berkeleyvision.org



github.com/BVLC/caffe

fcn.berkeleyvision.org

model example inference example solving example