
A Multiscale Framework for Challenging Discrete Optimization

Shai Bagon Meirav Galun
 Department of Computer Science
 Weizmann Institute of Science
 Rehovot, Israel

www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~{bagon,meirav}

Abstract

Current state-of-the-art discrete optimization methods struggle behind when it comes to challenging contrast-enhancing discrete energies (i.e., favoring different labels for neighboring variables). This work suggests a multiscale approach for these challenging problems. Deriving an algebraic representation allows us to coarsen any pair-wise energy using any interpolation in a principled algebraic manner. Furthermore, we propose an energy-aware interpolation operator that efficiently exposes the multiscale landscape of the energy yielding an effective coarse-to-fine optimization scheme. Results on challenging contrast-enhancing energies show significant improvement over state-of-the-art methods.

1 Introduction

We consider discrete pair-wise energies, defined over a (weighted) graph $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$:

$$E(L) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varphi_i(l_i) + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} w_{ij} \cdot \varphi(l_i, l_j) \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{V} is the set of variables and \mathcal{E} is the set of edges. The sought solution is a discrete vector: $L \in \{1, \dots, l\}^n$, with n variables each taking one of l possible labels, minimizing (1).

Most energy instances of form (1) considered in the literature are *smoothness preserving*: that is, assigning neighboring variables to the same label costs less energy. Smoothness preserving energies include submodular [15], metric and semi-metric [4] energies. State-of-the-art optimization algorithms (e.g., TRW-S [11], large move [4] and dual decomposition (DD) [13]) handles smoothness preserving energies well yielding close to optimal results. However, when it comes to *contrast-enhancing* energies (i.e., favoring different labels for neighboring variables) existing algorithms provide poor approximations (see e.g., [17, example 8.1], [11, §5.1]). For contrast-enhancing energies the relaxation of TRW and DD is no longer tight and therefore they converge to a far from optimal solution.

This work suggests a multiscale approach to the optimization of contrast-enhancing energies. Coarse-to-fine exploration of the solution space allows us to effectively avoid getting stuck in local minima. Our work makes two major contributions: (i) **An algebraic representation** of the energy allows for a *principled* derivation of the coarse scale energy using any coarse-to-fine interpolation. (ii) **Energy-aware** method for computing the interpolation operator efficiently exposes the multiscale landscape of the energy.

Multiscale approaches for discrete optimization has been proposed in the past (e.g., [7, 14, 6, 10, 12, 9]). However, they focus mainly on accelerating the optimization process of smoothness preserving energies. Furthermore, these methods are usually restricted to a diadic coarsening of grid-based

energies, and suggest “ad-hoc” and heuristic derivation of the coarse-scale energy (e.g., [10, §3]). In contrast, our framework suggests a *principled* derivation of coarse scale energy using a novel energy-aware interpolation yielding low energy solutions.

2 Multiscale Energy Pyramid

Our algebraic representation requires the substitution of vector L in (1) with an equivalent binary matrix representation $U \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times l}$. The rows of U correspond to the variables, and the columns corresponds to labels: $U_{i,\alpha} = 1$ iff variable i is labeled “ α ” ($l_i = \alpha$). Expressing the energy (1) using U yields a quadratic representation:

$$E(U) = \text{Tr}(DU^T + WUVU^T) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t. } U \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times l}, \sum_{\alpha=1}^l U_{i\alpha} = 1 \quad (3)$$

where $W = \{w_{ij}\}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$ s.t. $D_{i,\alpha} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi_i(\alpha)$, and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ s.t. $V_{\alpha,\beta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi(\alpha, \beta)$, $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. An energy over n variables with l labels is now parameterized by (n, l, D, W, V) .

Let (n^f, l, D^f, W^f, V) be the fine scale energy. We wish to generate a coarser representation (n^c, l, D^c, W^c, V) with fewer variables $n^c < n^f$. This representation approximates $E(U^f)$ using fewer *variables*: U^c with only n^c rows.

An interpolation matrix $P \in [0, 1]^{n^f \times n^c}$ s.t. $\sum_j P_{ij} = 1 \forall i$, maps coarse assignment U^c to fine assignment PU^c . For any fine assignment that can be approximated by a coarse assignment U^c , i.e., $U^f = PU^c$, we can write eq. (2):

$$\begin{aligned} E(U^f) &= \text{Tr}(D^f U^f T + W^f U^f V U^f T) = \text{Tr}(D^f U^c T P^T + W^f P U^c V U^c T P^T) \quad (4) \\ &= \text{Tr}\left(\underbrace{(P^T D^f)}_{\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D^c} U^c T + \underbrace{(P^T W^f P)}_{\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W^c} U^c V U^c T\right) = \text{Tr}(D^c U^c T + W^c U^c V U^c T) = E(U^c) \end{aligned}$$

We have generated a coarse energy $E(U^c)$ parameterized by (n^c, l, D^c, W^c, V) that approximates the fine energy $E(U^f)$. This coarse energy is *of the same form* as the original energy allowing us to apply the coarsening procedure recursively to construct an energy pyramid.

Our principled algebraic representation allows us to perform label coarsening in a similar manner.

Looking at a different interpolation matrix $\hat{P} \in [0, 1]^{l^f \times l^c}$, we interpolate a coarse solution by $U^{\hat{f}} \leftarrow U^{\hat{c}} \hat{P}^T$. This time the interpolation matrix \hat{P} acts on the *labels*, i.e., the *columns* of U . The coarse labeling matrix $U^{\hat{c}}$ has the same number of rows (variables), but fewer columns (labels). Coarsening the labels yields:

$$E(U^{\hat{c}}) = \text{Tr}\left(\left(D^{\hat{f}} \hat{P}\right) U^{\hat{c}T} + W U^{\hat{c}} \left(\hat{P}^T V^{\hat{f}} \hat{P}\right) U^{\hat{c}T}\right) \quad (5)$$

Again, we end up with the same type of energy, but this time it is defined over a smaller number of discrete labels: $(n, l^c, D^{\hat{c}}, W, V^{\hat{c}})$, where $D^{\hat{c}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D^{\hat{f}} \hat{P}$ and $V^{\hat{c}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{P}^T V^{\hat{f}} \hat{P}$.


Equations (4) and (5) encapsulate one of our key contributions: Constructing an energy pyramid depends only on P . For *any* interpolation P it is straightforward to derive the coarse-scale energy in a *principled* manner. But what is an appropriate interpolation?

3 Energy-aware Interpolation

The effectiveness of the multiscale approximation of (4) and (5) heavily depends on the interpolation matrix P (\hat{P} resp.). The matrix P can be interpreted as an operator that aggregates fine-scale variables into coarse ones (Fig. 1). Aggregating fine variables i and j into a coarser one excludes from the search space all assignments for which $l_i \neq l_j$. This aggregation is undesired if assigning i

and j to different labels yields low energy. However, when variables i and j are *in agreement* under the energy (i.e., assignments with $l_i = l_j$ yield low energy), aggregating them together allows for efficient exploration of low energy assignments. **A desired interpolation aggregates i and j when i and j are in agreement under the energy.**

Figure 1: **Interpolation as soft variable aggregation:** *fine* variables 1, 2, 3 and 4 are softly aggregated into *coarse* variables 1 and 2. For example, *fine* variable 1 is a convex combination of .7 of 1 and .3 of 2. Hard aggregation is a special case where P is a binary matrix. In that case each *fine* variable is influenced by exactly one *coarse* variable.



To estimate these agreements we empirically generate several samples with relatively low energy, and measure the label agreement between neighboring variables i and j in these samples. We use Iterated Conditional Modes (ICM) [3] to obtain locally low energy assignments. This procedure may be interpreted as Gibbs sampling from the Gibbs distribution $p(U) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{T}E(U))$ at the limit $T \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., the “zero-temperature” limit). Performing $t = 10$ ICM iterations with $K = 10$ random restarts provides us with K samples $\{L^k\}_{k=1}^K$. The disagreement between neighboring variable i and j is estimated as $d_{ij} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_k V_{l_i^k, l_j^k}$,

where l_i^k is the label of variable i in the k^{th} sample. Their agreement is then given by $c_{ij} = \exp\left(-\frac{d_{ij}}{\sigma}\right)$, with $\sigma \propto \max V$.

Using the variable agreements, c_{ij} , we follow the Algebraic Multigrid (AMG) method of [5] to first determine the set of coarse scale variables and then construct an interpolation matrix P that softly aggregates fine scale variables according to their agreement with the coarse ones.

We begin by selecting a set of coarse representative variables $\mathcal{V}^c \subset \mathcal{V}^f$, such that every variable in $\mathcal{V}^f \setminus \mathcal{V}^c$ is in agreement with \mathcal{V}^c . A variable i is considered in agreement with \mathcal{V}^c if $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}^c} c_{ij} \geq \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}^f} c_{ij}$. That is, every variable in \mathcal{V}^f is either in \mathcal{V}^c or is *in agreement* with other variables in \mathcal{V}^c , and thus well represented in the coarse scale.

We perform this selection greedily and sequentially, starting with $\mathcal{V}^c = \emptyset$ adding i to \mathcal{V}^c if it is not yet in agreement with \mathcal{V}^c . The parameter β affects the coarsening rate, i.e., the ratio n^c/n^f , smaller β results in a lower ratio.

At the end of this process we have a set of coarse representatives \mathcal{V}^c . The interpolation matrix P is then defined by:

$$P_{iI(j)} = \begin{cases} c_{ij} & i \in \mathcal{V}^f \setminus \mathcal{V}^c, j \in \mathcal{V}^c \\ 1 & i \in \mathcal{V}^c, j = i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Where $I(j)$ is the coarse index of the variable whose fine index is j (in Fig. 1: $I(2) = 1$ and $I(3) = 2$).

We further prune rows of P leaving only δ maximal entries. Each row is then normalized to sum to 1. Throughout our experiments we use $\beta = 0.2$ and $\delta = 3$ for computing P .

4 A Unified Discrete Multiscale Framework

Given an energy (n, l, D, W, V) at scale $s = 0$, our framework first works fine-to-coarse to compute interpolation matrices $\{P^s\}$ that construct the “energy pyramid”: $\{(n^s, l, D^s, W^s, V)\}_{s=0, \dots, S}$. Typically we reduce the number of variables by a factor of 2 between consecutive levels, resulting with less than 10 variables at the coarsest scale. Since there are very few degrees of freedom at the coarsest scale ICM¹ is likely to obtain a low-energy coarse solution. Then, at each scale s the coarse solution U^s is interpolated to a finer scale $s - 1$: $\tilde{U}^{s-1} \leftarrow P^s U^s$. At the finer scale \tilde{U}^{s-1} serves as a good initialization for ICM (fractional solutions are rounded). These two steps of interpolation followed by refinement are repeated for all scales from coarse to fine.

¹Our framework is not restricted to ICM and may utilize other single-scale optimization algorithms.

Table 1: **Synthetic results:** Showing percent of achieved energy value relative to the lower bound computed by TRW-S (closer to 100% is better) for ICM and TRW-S for varying strengths of the pair-wise term ($\lambda = 5, 10, 15$, stronger \rightarrow harder to optimize.)

λ	ICM		TRW-S
	Ours	single scale	
5	112.6%	115.9%	116.6%
10	123.6%	130.2%	134.6%
15	127.1%	135.8%	138.3%

Table 2: **Co-clustering results:** Baseline for comparison are state-of-the-art results of [8]. (a) We report our results as percent of the baseline: smaller is better, lower than 100% even outperforms state-of-the-art. (b) We also report the fraction of energies for which our multiscale framework outperform state-of-the-art.

	Ours	ICM single scale	TRW-S
(a)	99.9%	177.7%	176.2%
(b)	55.6%	0.0%	0.5%

ICM and our energy-aware interpolation play complementary roles in this multiscale framework. ICM makes fine scale *local* refitments of a given labeling, while the energy-aware interpolation makes coarse grouping of variables to expose *global* behavior of the energy. In a sense, ICM is a discrete equivalent to the continuous Gauss-Seidel relaxation used in continuous domain multiscale schemes.

5 Experimental Results

We evaluated our multiscale framework on challenging contrast enhancing synthetic, as well as on co-clustering energies. We follow the protocol of [16] that uses the a *lower bound* as a baseline for comparing performance of different optimization methods on different energies. We report the ratio between the resulting energy and the lower bound (in percents), **closer to 100% is better**².

Synthetic: We begin with synthetic *contrast-enhancing* energies defined over a 4-connected grid graph of size 50×50 ($n = 2500$), and $l = 5$ labels. The unary term $D \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The pair-wise term $V_{\alpha\beta} = V_{\beta\alpha} \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ ($V_{\alpha\alpha} = 0$) and $w_{ij} = w_{ji} \sim \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$. The parameter λ controls the relative strength of the pair-wise term, stronger (i.e., larger λ) results with energies more difficult to optimize (see [11]). The resulting synthetic energies are contrast-enhancing (since w_{ij} may become negative). Table 1 shows results, averaged over 100 experiments. Using **our** multiscale framework to perform coarse-to-fine optimization of the energy yields significantly lower energies than single-scale methods used (ICM and TRW-S).

Co-clustering (Correlation-Clustering): The problem of co-clustering addresses the matching of superpixels within and across frames in a video sequence. Following [2, §6.2], we treat co-clustering as a minimization of a discrete Potts energy adaptively adjusting the number of labels. The resulting energies are contrast-enhancing (with some $w_{ij} < 0$), have no underlying regular grid, and are very challenging to optimize. We obtained 77 co-clustering energies, courtesy of [8], used in their experiments. Table 2 compares our discrete multiscale framework to the state-of-the-art results of [8] obtained by applying specially tailored convex relaxation method. Our multiscale framework improves state-of-the-art for this family of challenging energies and significantly outperforms TRW-S.

6 Extensions

It is rather straightforward to extend our framework to handle energies with different V for every pair (i, j) . Moreover, higher order potentials can also be considered using the same algebraic representation. A detailed derivation may be found in [1].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Maria Zontak and Daniel Glasner for their insightful remarks and discussions.

²Matlab implementation is available at: www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~bagon/matlab.html

References

- [1] S. Bagon. *Discrete Energy Minimization, beyond Submodular: Applications and Approximations*. PhD thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science, 2012.
- [2] S. Bagon and M. Galun. Large scale correlation clustering optimization. *arXiv*, 2011.
- [3] J. Besag. On the statistical analysis of dirty pictures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1986.
- [4] Y. Boykov, O. Veksler, and R. Zabih. Fast approximate energy minimization via graph cuts. *PAMI*, 2002.
- [5] A. Brandt. Algebraic multigrid theory: The symmetric case. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 1986.
- [6] P. Felzenszwalb and D. Huttenlocher. Efficient belief propagation for early vision. *IJCV*, 2006.
- [7] B. Gidas. A renormalization group approach to image processing problems. *PAMI*, 1989.
- [8] D. Glasner, S. N. Vitaladevuni, and R. Basri. Contour-based joint clustering of multiple segmentations. In *CVPR*, 2011.
- [9] T. Kim, S. Nowozin, P. Kohli, and C. Yoo. Variable grouping for energy minimization. In *CVPR*, 2011.
- [10] P. Kohli, V. Lempitsky, and C. Rother. Uncertainty driven multiscale optimization. In *DAGM*, 2010.
- [11] V. Kolmogorov. Convergent tree-reweighted message passing for energy minimization. *PAMI*, 2006.
- [12] N. Komodakis. Towards more efficient and effective LP-based algorithms for MRF optimization. In *ECCV*, 2010.
- [13] N. Komodakis, N. Paragios, and G. Tziritas. MRF energy minimization and beyond via dual decomposition. *PAMI*, 2011.
- [14] P. Pérez and F. Heitz. Restriction of a markov random field on a graph and multiresolution statistical image modeling. *IEEE Tran. on Inf. Theory*, 1996.
- [15] D. Schlesinger and B. Flach. Transforming an arbitrary minsum problem into a binary one. Technical report, TU, Fak. Informatik, 2006.
- [16] R. Szeliski, R. Zabih, D. Scharstein, O. Veksler, V. Kolmogorov, A. Agarwala, M. Tappen, and C. Rother. A comparative study of energy minimization methods for markov random fields with smoothness-based priors. *PAMI*, 2008.
- [17] M. Wainwright, T. Jaakkola, and A. Willsky. MAP estimation via agreement on trees: message-passing and linear programming. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 2005.