



Long-tailed Object Detection Pretraining: Dynamic Rebalancing Contrastive Learning with Dual Reconstruction

Chen-Long Duan^{1†}, Yong Li^{1†}, Xiu-Shen Wei^{2*}, Lin Zhao¹

November 05, 2024

¹Nanjing University of Science and Technology,

²School of Computer Science and Engineering, and Key Laboratory of New Generation Artificial Intelligence Technology and Its Interdisciplinary Applications, Southeast University







Image classification







Continue





Games





Limitations of deep learning models

• Deep learning models often rely on large training datasets.

• Real-world data often exhibits a long-tailed distribution.

• Humans can learn from one or few examples, thanks to their rich prior knowledge.





Pre-training for Object Detection

- Long-tailed Object Detection
- > Simplicity Bias

Method	Backbone	Neck	Head
Supervised Backbone	\checkmark	×	×
MoCo, SwAV, BYOL	\checkmark	×	×
DenseCL, DetCo, DetCon	\checkmark	×	×
PixPro, SoCo	\checkmark	\checkmark	×
UP-DETR, DETReg, AlignDet	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark





- Long-tailed Object Detection
- > Simplicity Bias



[L. Yang et al., International Journal of Computer Vision 2022]





Introduction (con't)

Pre-training for Object Detection



Long-tailed Object Detection Whipped cream, Crape Crouton, Lettuce Antenna, Machine gun Money, Igniter **Simplicity Bias** \triangleright Input Image An often-overlooked but Baseline crucial challenge in long-ECM tailed object detection is simplicity bias.



Attention Magnitude (Red indicates high attention)





Overall framework of 2DRCL: Our 2DRCL framework integrates three key components: Holistic-Local Contrastive Learning, Dynamic Rebalancing, and Dual Reconstruction.











Our 2DRCL (con't)

Dynamic Rebalancing





$$r_c = \max\left(1, \sqrt{t/f_c}\right)$$







Dual Reconstruction









Main results comparisons (COCO)

Backbone Initialization	Methods	AP^{bb}	AP_{50}^{bb}	AP_{75}^{bb}	AP^{mk}	$\operatorname{AP}_{50}^{mk}$	$\operatorname{AP}_{75}^{mk}$
From scratch	DenseCL [49]	39.6	59.3	43.3	-	-	-
	Self-EMD [34] SoCo [50]	40.4 40.6	61.1 61.1	43.7 44.4	- 37.4	- 56.5	39. 7
	SlotCon [55]	41.0	6 1.1	45.0	-	-	-
ImageNet pre-trained backbone	Surpervised	38.3	58.0	42.1	34.3	54.9	36.6
	AlignDet [25]	39.4	59.2	43.2	35.3	56.1	37.7
	Ours	41.4	61.3	45.8	37.4	57.2	39.4

Table 1: Comparisons with state-of-the-art methods on COCO (Mask R-CNN with R50-FPN).





Main results comparisons (LVIS v1.0)

Table 3: Comparisons with state-of-the-art methods on LVIS v1.0 with a $2 \times$ schedule.

(a) Faster R-CNN with R50-FPN.

(b) Mask R-CNN with ResNet-50/101.

Method	AP^{bb}	AP_r^{bb}	AP_c^{bb}	$\operatorname{AP}_{f}^{bb}$
BCE [40]	19.5	1.6	16.6	30.6
RFS [11]	24.2	14.2	22.3	30.6
DropLoss [19]	21.8	5.2	21.8	29.1
PCB [17]	23.0	6.2	21.5	32.2
EQLv2 [42]	25.4	15.8	23.5	31.7
Seesaw [45]	26.4	16.8	25.1	32.2
BAGS [27]	23.7	14.2	22.2	29.6
ACSL [48]	22.2	9.9	21.3	28.5
LOCE [9]	25.1	15.7	24.2	30.1
BACL [38]	26.1	16.0	25.7	30.9
ECM [22]	26.7	17.5	25.7	32.2
Ours	27.3	18.6	25.8	32.6

Backbone	Method	AP	AP_r	AP_c	AP_{f}	AP^{bb}
R50-FPN	CE	18.7	0.4	16.5	29.3	19.7
	RFS [11]	23.7	14.2	22.9	29.3	24.7
	EQLv2 [42]	25.2	17.4	24.1	29.9	26.0
	LOCE [9]	26.6	18.5	26.2	30.7	27.4
	SeeSaw [45]	26.9	19.6	26.8	30.5	27.3
	ECM [22]	27.4	19.7	27.0	31.1	27.9
	Ours	27.7	20.4	27.1	31.4	28.3
R101-FPN	CE	25.5	16.6	24.5	30.6	26.6
	EQLv2 [42]	27.2	20.6	25.9	31.4	27.9
	SeeSaw [45]	28.2	20.3	28.1	31.8	29.0
	ECM [22]	28.7	21.9	28.4	32.2	29.4
	Ours	28.8	21.1	28.7	32.3	29.6



Experiments (con't)



Tricycle

Simplicity Bias Analyses

2DRCL (w/o DRC) 2DRCL



Attention Magnitude (Red indicates high attention)

