Maximum Persistency in Energy Minimization

Alexander Shekhovtsov, TU Graz

June 25, 2014

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ → □ → つくで

Discrete Energy Minimization



• Minimize partially separable function

$$E_f(x) = f_0 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}} f_s(x_s) + \sum_{st \in \mathcal{E}} f_{st}(x_s, x_t),$$

over assignments (labelings): $x = (x_s \in \mathcal{L}_s \mid s \in \mathcal{V})$

- studied as MAP MRF/CRF, WCSP
- NP-hard to approximate (e.g. Orponen 1990 for TSP)
- This work: reduce domains (sets of labels \mathcal{L}_s) while retaining some/all optimal solutions, in polynomial time

Partial Optimality

Example to illustrate what is the hope here:

Stereo Reconstruction (Model of Alahari *et al.* 2010)



Partial Optimality (Method of Kovtun, 2010)



(日) (四) (三) (三)

 Can find a partial assignment that holds for any global optimum, which is unknown

Several Different Methods

There were proposed several substantially different methods:

- Dead End Elimination (DEE)
- Persistency in Quadratic Pseudo-Boolean Optimization (QPBO)
- MQPBO
- Methods of Kovtun 04, 10
- Methods of Swoboda et al. 13 (14)

What do they have in common?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ → □ → つくで

Improving Mappings

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - 釣��

Improving Mapping



Definition

Mapping $p: \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ is improving if $(\forall x \in \mathcal{L}) E_f(p(x)) \le E_f(x)$ strictly improving if $x \neq p(x) \Rightarrow E_f(p(x)) < E_f(x)$

- If x is optimal then p(x) is optimal
- For strictly improving all optimal solutions are in $p(\mathcal{L})$
- Composition: if p, q are improving $\Rightarrow p \circ q$ is improving: $E_f(p(q(x))) \le E_f(q(x)) \le f(x)$

Introduction Mappings Generalized Sufficient Condition Maximum Persistency Experiments References

Dead End Elimination (DEE)

Family of methods by Desmet et al. 1992, Goldstein 1994, etc.



- Apply mapping in a single pixel s
- Improving iff

 $f_{s}(\alpha) - f_{s}(\beta) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{N}(s)} \min_{x_{t} \in \mathcal{L}_{t}} [f_{st}(\alpha, x_{t}) - f_{st}(\beta, x_{t})] \geq 0$

(worst case energy change over neighbours assignment)

• Compose many such mappings

Introduction Mappings Generalized Sufficient Condition Maximum Persistency Experiments References

Quadratic Pseudo-Boolean Optimization (QPBO)

Nemhauser and Trotter 75, Hammer *et al.* 84, Boros *et al.* 02, Rother*et al.* 07



- Integral part of the LP relaxation is globally optimal $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{V}$, $y = (y_s \mid s \in \mathcal{A})$
- "Autarky": replace x with y on A (x[A ← y]) is guaranteed not to increase the energy mapping x → x[A ← y] is improving

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲国▶ ▲国▶ - 国 - のへで

Multilabel QPBO (MQPBO)

Kohli et al. 08, Windheuser et al. 12



- Fixed linear ordering
- Reduction to pseudo-Boolean + QPBO guarantees
- "Autarky": mapping $x \mapsto (x \lor x^{\min}) \land x^{\max}$ is improving

Kovtun one vs. all Method

Kovtun 2004, 2010



- Builds auxiliary submodular 2-label energy for given y
- "Autarky": mapping $x \mapsto x[\mathcal{A} \leftarrow y]$ is improving

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ 目 のへで

Kovtun general Method

Kovtun 2004, 2010



- Builds auxiliary submodular multilabel energy and y
- Mapping $x \mapsto (x \lor y)$ is improving

Iterative Pruning

Swoboda et al. 2013, 2014



- Iteratively builds auxiliary energy and solves its LP relaxation
- "Autarky": mapping $x \mapsto x[\mathcal{A} \leftarrow y]$ is improving

・ロト ・ 日 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト - ヨ - -

Verification Problem

• Verifying whether $p: \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ is improving is NP-hard

e.g., Boros *et al*. 2006

Determining whether a partial assignment is an autarky is NP-hard

• How do these methods find one? - Finer sufficient conditions.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ - の < ℃ 13/26

Generalized Sufficient Condition

LP Relaxation

Schlesinger 76, Koster *et al.* 98, 99, Chekuri *et al.* 01, Wainwright *et al.* 02, Werner 08.



- Embedding: $\delta(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$
- $E_f(x) = \langle f, \delta(x) \rangle$
- Relaxation:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{L}} \langle f, \delta(x) \rangle \geq \min_{\mu \in \Lambda} \langle f, \mu \rangle$$

• $\Lambda \supset \operatorname{conv}(\delta(\mathcal{L}))$

Relaxed Improving Mapping



Linear Extension

$$(\forall x \in \mathcal{L}) \ \delta(p(x)) = P\delta(x)$$

(ロ) (四) (三) (三) (三) (16/26)

Relaxed Improving Mapping



Linear Extension

$$(\forall x \in \mathcal{L}) \ \delta(p(x)) = P\delta(x)$$

Definition

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Mapping } p \colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L} \text{ is Relaxed-improving if} \\ \left(\forall \mu \in \Lambda \right) \ \left\langle f, P \mu \right\rangle \leq \left\langle f, \mu \right\rangle \end{array}$

Introduction Mappings Generalized Sufficient Condition Maximum Persistency Experiments References

Relaxed Improving Mapping

Improving	Relaxed-Improving
$(\forall x) E_f(p(x)) \leq E_f(x)$	$(\forall \mu \in \Lambda) \ \langle f, P\mu \rangle \leq \langle f, \mu \rangle$
	$\Lambda\supsetconv(\delta(\mathcal{L}))$

Sufficient condition

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ ■▶ ◆ ■▶ ● ■ の ९ 07/26

Introduction Mappings Generalized Sufficient Condition Maximum Persistency Experiments References

Relaxed Improving Mapping

Improving	Relaxed-Improving
$(\forall x) E_f(p(x)) \leq E_f(x)$	$(\forall \mu \in \Lambda) \ \langle f, P\mu \rangle \leq \langle f, \mu \rangle$
	$\Lambda\supsetconv(\delta(\mathcal{L}))$

- Sufficient condition
- Can be verified via LP: $\min_{\mu\in\Lambda}\langle f,(I-P)\mu
 angle\leq 0$

Relaxed Improving Mapping

Improving	Relaxed-Improving
$(\forall x) E_f(p(x)) \leq E_f(x)$	$(\forall \mu \in \Lambda) \ \langle f, P\mu \rangle \leq \langle f, \mu \rangle$
	$\Lambda\supsetconv(\delta(\mathcal{L}))$

- Sufficient condition
- Can be verified via LP: $\min_{\mu \in \Lambda} \langle f, (I P) \mu \rangle \leq 0$

Theorem

Relaxed-improving condition is satisfied for all methods:

- Goldstein's General DEE
- QPBO
- MQPBO (prev. work, Shekhovtsov et al. 07)
- Methods of Kovtun (prev. work, Shekhovtsov et al. 12)
- Methods of Swoboda *et al.* 13 (14*)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ の < ℃ 18/26

- Given that verification problem is polynomially solvable,
- Which method is better?

Proposition

Pose "the best partial optimality" as optimization problem

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ - の < ♡ 19/26

- Given that verification problem is polynomially solvable,
- Which method is better?

Proposition

Pose "the best partial optimality" as optimization problem

Find the mapping $p \colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ that delivers the maximum problem reduction:

$$\min_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{s}|p(\mathcal{L}_{s})| \quad \text{s.t. } p \text{ is relaxed improving for } f,$$

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{P}}$ - class of mappings.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ - の < ♡ 19/26

- For pseudo-Boolean case is solved by QPBO (strong and weak persistency)
- Polynomial for further cases

<ロト <回ト <三ト <三ト = 三

- For pseudo-Boolean case is solved by QPBO (strong and weak persistency)
- Polynomial for further cases



Covers:

- Swoboda et al. 13 (14*)
- QPBO
- one vs. all Kovtun 04

Subset-to-one maps



- General method of Kovtun
- DEE if applied K times
- Other case, if y selected by LP

Method

Maximum Persistency

$$\begin{split} \min_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{s} |p(\mathcal{L}_{s})| \\ \text{s.t.} \ \min_{\mu \in \Lambda} \langle f, (I - P) \mu \rangle \leq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\exists \varphi) \ (I - P)^{\mathsf{T}} f - \varphi A^{\mathsf{T}} \geq 0 \end{split}$$

Reformulate as a linear program, L1

- Optimizes over relaxed mapping and reparametrization jointly
- Optimal solution recovers optimal discrete mapping

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ - の < ℃ 21/26

Experimental Validation



- 10 × 10 Grid graph, random weights
- All test problems have integrality gap (not LP-tight)
- Verified correctness by solving LP

A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A

э

ъ

Windowing



• Can restrict mapping to a window - global correctness guarantees (generalization of DEE)

Conclusion

- + Generalized sufficient condition
- + Direct formulation of the maximum persistency
- + Optimal method in a range of cases
- - Requires to solve LP



K. Alahari, P. Kohli, and P. H. S. Torr.

Reduce, reuse & recycle: Efficiently solving multi-label MRFs. In CVPR, 2008.



E. Boros and P. Hammer.

Pseudo-Boolean optimization.

Discrete Applied Mathematics, 1-3(123):155-225, 2002.



C. Chekuri, S. Khanna, J. Naor, and L. Zosin.

Approximation algorithms for the metric labeling problem via a new linear programming formulation. In *In Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 109–118, 2001.



J. Desmet, M. D. Maeyer, B. Hazes, and I. Lasters.

The dead-end elimination theorem and its use in protein side-chain positioning. *Nature*, 356:539–542, 1992.



R. F. Goldstein.

Efficient rotamer elimination applied to protein side-chains and related spin glasses. *Biophysical Journal*, 66(5):1335–1340, May 1994.



P. Hammer, P. Hansen, and B. Simeone.

Roof duality, complementation and persistency in quadratic 0-1 optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 121–155, 1984.



P. Kohli, A. Shekhovtsov, C. Rother, V. Kolmogorov, and P. Torr.

On partial optimality in multi-label MRFs. In *ICML*, pages 480–487, 2008.



A. M. Koster, S. Hoesel, and A. Kolen.

The partial constraint satisfaction problem: Facets and lifting theorems. *Operations Research Letters*, 23:89–97(9), 1998.

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト 三日



I. Kovtun.

Partial optimal labeling search for a NP-hard subclass of (max, +) problems. In *DAGM-Symposium*, pages 402–409, 2003.



I. Kovtun.

Image segmentation based on sufficient conditions of optimality in NP-complete classes of structural labelling problem.

PhD thesis, IRTC ITS National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine, 2004. In Ukrainian.



I. Kovtun.

Sufficient condition for partial optimality for (max, +) labeling problems and its usage. Control Systems and Computers, (2), 2011. Special issue.



G. L. Nemhauser and L. E. Trotter, Jr.

Vertex packings: Structural properties and algorithms. *Mathematical Programming*, 8:232–248, 1975.



P. Orponen and H. Mannila.

On approximation preserving reductions: Complete problems and robust measures (revised version). Technical report, 1990.



C. Rother, V. Kolmogorov, V. Lempitsky, and M. Szummer.

Optimizing binary MRFs via extended roof duality. In CVPR, 2007.



A. Shekhovtsov and V. Hlaváč.

On partial opimality by auxiliary submodular problems. *Control Systems and Computers*, (2), 2011. Special issue.

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト 三日



A. Shekhovtsov, V. Kolmogorov, P. Kohli, V. Hlavac, C. Rother, and P. Torr.

LP-relaxation of binarized energy minimization. Technical Report CTU-CMP-2007-27, Czech Technical University, 2008.



P. Swoboda, B. Savchynskyy, J. Kappes, and C. Schnörr.

Partial optimality via iterative pruning for the Potts model. In SSVM, 2013.



P. Swoboda, B. Savchynskyy, J. H. Kappes, and C. Schnörr.

Partial optimality by pruning for MAP-inference with general graphical models. In CVPR, page 8, 2014.



M. J. Wainwright and M. I. Jordan.

Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 1(1-2):1–305, 2008.



T. Werner.

A linear programming approach to max-sum problem: A review. PAMI, 29(7):1165–1179, July 2007.



Generalized roof duality for multi-label optimization: Optimal lower bounds and persistency. In ECCV, 2012.

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト 三日