

Semi-supervised Object Detection: A Survey on Recent Research and Progress

YANYANG WANG, ZHAOXIANG LIU, AND SHIGUO LIAN

Unicom Digital Technology, China Unicom, Beijing 100013, China

Corresponding author: Zhaoxiang Liu (e-mail: liuwx178@chinaunicom.cn), Shiguo Lian (e-mail: liansg@chinaunicom.cn)

arXiv:2306.14106v1 [cs.CV] 25 Jun 2023

ABSTRACT In recent years, deep learning technology has been maturely applied in the field of object detection, and most algorithms tend to be supervised learning. However, a large amount of labeled data requires high costs of human resources, which brings about low efficiency and limitations. Semi-supervised object detection (SSOD) has been paid more and more attentions due to its high research value and practicability. It is designed to learn information by using small amounts of labeled data and large amounts of unlabeled data. In this paper, we present a comprehensive and up-to-date survey on the SSOD approaches from five aspects. We first briefly introduce several ways of data augmentation. Then, we dive the mainstream semi-supervised strategies into pseudo labels, consistent regularization, graph based and transfer learning based methods, and introduce some methods in challenging settings. We further present widely-used loss functions, and then we outline the common benchmark datasets and compare the accuracy among different representative approaches. Finally, we conclude this paper and present some promising research directions for the future. Our survey aims to provide researchers and practitioners new to the field as well as more advanced readers with a solid understanding of the main approaches developed over the past few years.

INDEX TERMS Object detection, Pseudo label, Semi-supervised learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN recent years, deep learning techniques have achieved great results in data mining, computer vision, natural language processing, multimedia learning, etc. Object detection is one of the most important and challenging branches in computer vision, and it has been widely used in people's lives, such as surveillance security and automatic driving. With the rapid development of deep learning networks for detection tasks, the performance of object detectors has been greatly improved. To perform the detection tasks, deep learning techniques accomplish object localization and classification by extracting and analyzing features of sample data, so labeled samples provide a large data base for object detection tasks and large dataset such as MS-COCO [3] has largely triggered the boom of deep learning in object detection.

However, in many real-world object detection tasks, the labeled samples need a lot of manual labeling and thus require a lot of human and financial resources, so it is difficult to obtain sufficient labeled data in some cases. All of the above reasons lead to samples with few labels and even fewer high quality labels. Besides that, a small amount of data can not satisfy the training requirements of the model, and the accuracy and robustness of the model will be affected. Therefore, during the training process, the information of a large number of

unlabeled samples needs to be reasonably used, which can effectively improve the task performance. Semi-supervised learning makes a great contribution in this direction and a large body of work have investigated the application of semi-supervised techniques to object detection tasks.

However, to our best knowledge, no review has been done for the recently emerged semi-supervised learning based object detection methods. This survey will provide a comprehensive review of the state-of-the-art (SOTA) algorithms for semi-supervised object detection, whose innovation points and frameworks are described in detail. A SSOD system generally consists of three modules: data augmentation, semi-supervised strategy and loss function. We also construct taxonomy from the process of SSOD to overview all these approaches(as shown in Fig. 1).The subsequent content of the article is organized as follows: related work in Section II, introduction to data augmentation in Section III, semi-supervised strategies in Section IV, challenging settings in Section V, overview of loss in Section VI, datasets and comparison results in Section VII, conclusion and future directions in Section VIII.

II. RELATED WORK

Semi-supervised learning is a learning method that combines supervised learning with unsupervised learning and focuses on how to make reasonable use of labeled and unlabeled samples in the training process [4] [5]. It establishes the relationship between predicted samples and learning objectives by applying some hypotheses: (1) The smoothness assumption assumes that two samples are more likely to have the same class labels when they are closely located in a high-density region. (2) The cluster assumption assumes that when two samples are in the same cluster, they are very likely to be of the same class. (3) The manifold assumption assumes that two samples have similar class labels when they lie within a small local neighborhood in the low-dimensional manifold.

Based on these assumptions, there are many well-established algorithms often applied to image classification tasks, and the papers [4]-[8] provide comprehensive surveys to these algorithms. These semi-supervised learning methods for image classification can be classified into the following categories: generative methods [9] [10]; graph-based methods [11] [12]; consistency regularization methods [13] [14]; pseudo-label methods [15]-[18] and hybrid methods [19]-[21].

There have been already some reviews doing research on supervised learning object detection. Specifically, the paper [1] provides a comprehensive survey of many aspects of generic object detection research: leading detection frameworks and fundamental subproblems including object feature representation, object proposal generation, context information modeling, training strategies and evaluation issues. The paper [2] lists the traditional and new applications, and also introduces representative branches of object detection. The paper [3] provides an in-depth analysis of major object detectors in both categories-one and two stage detectors, and also presents a detailed evaluation of the landmark backbone architectures and lightweight models.

Though there are already some surveys about semi-supervised image classification and supervised object detection, as far as we know, our paper is the first review on semi-supervised object detection.

III. DATA AUGMENTATION

Data augmentation is critical to improve model generalization and robustness, which is the first step in SSOD. In order to improve the robustness of the model and make reasonable use of unlabeled data information, consistency regularization is used to constraint the augmented data for the consistency of output labels. The ways of augmentation are quite different because of the discrepancy between different ways.

A. STRONG AUGMENTATION

Strong augmentation ways can enrich the data set and improve the model performance easily. The methods in articles [29] [31] utilize color jittering, grayscale, gaussian blur, and cutout patches to augment data. And, cutout has a weak regularization effect.

B. WEAK AUGMENTATION

Weak augmentation usually uses simple graphic transformation. Random horizontal flipping, random resizing and multi-scale are some regular weak augmentation ways[22] [23]. Mixmatch [19] expands the training data set by mixing up images from different classes randomly. Mix up has the problem of class ambiguity of mixture between backgrounds and objects.

C. HYBRID AUGMENTATION

To avoid above problems, both weak and strong augmentation are applied to a mini-batch unlabeled images in MUM method [25]. Besides, Instant-teaching [24] applies mosaic directly into pseudo label-based SSOD framework. STAC [26] explores different variants of transformation operations and determinates a group of effective combinations: 1) global color transformation; 2) global geometric transformation; 3) box-level transformation.

IV. SEMI-SUPERVISED STRATEGIES

As shown in Fig. 1, after data augmentation, the next step is to design a training framework to integrate information from both labeled and unlabeled images. Currently, SSOD methods follow four strategies. We will introduce some representative methods of these strategies, the flow charts of some classic methods are also presented.

A. PSEUDO LABELS

The first strategy is based on pseudo labels, as shown in Fig. 2, these methods estimate the pseudo labels for unlabeled images by using a pretrained model and then jointly train the model with both labeled and unlabeled data after augmentation. Most of them are based on two-stage anchor-based detector such as Faster-RCNN [52].

1) Self-training

Self-training uses labeled data to train a good teacher model which is used to predict the unlabeled data, and finally uses all data to train a student model. At present, many SSOD methods use the information of unlabeled samples by self-training for pseudo label prediction. It improves model performance by utilizing high-confidence samples with pseudo labels during the training process.

The study [27] reveals that self-training improves upon pretraining and shows the generality and flexibility of self-training. STAC [21] proposes a SSOD algorithm based on hard pseudo label. The labeled data is used to train a teacher model which can predict unlabeled data, and it uses a threshold in order to select high confidence pseudo label and calculates the pseudo label with the unsupervised loss of the strong augmentation unlabeled data and the supervised loss of the labeled data. An overview of STAC method is shown in Fig. 3.

In order to avoid ignoring the differences in the detection results in the same image during different training iterations and overfitting unlabeled data, as shown in Fig. 4, ISTM [28]




FIGURE 1. Taxonomy of SSOD from the process perspective.




FIGURE 2. The generation process of pseudo labels.




FIGURE 4. Overview of ISTM.




FIGURE 3. Overview of STAC.

proposes an interactive self-training model. On the one hand, it fuses the object detection results in different iterations with non-maximum suppression(NMS), on the other hand, it uses two region of interest(ROI) heads with different structures to estimate pseudo labels for each other.

The class imbalance hinders the use of self-training. To address this problem, ACRST [23] proposes adaptive class-rebalancing self-training frame by rebalancing the training data with foreground instances extracted from the crop bank which stores abundant instance-level annotations.

2) Optimized pseudo labels

STAC generates only one-time pseudo labels, however, using the initial prediction of pseudo labels will limit the model accuracy improvement.

To alleviate the confirmation bias problem and improve the quality of pseudo labels, most approaches rectify the pseudo labels in training phase. As shown in Fig. 5, a two-stage framework is utilized by Unbiased Teacher [31], this method mitigates the overfitting problem by using pseudo labels to train region proposal network (RPN) and ROI head, solves the problem of pseudo label bias and improves the quality of pseudo label by using exponential moving average (EMA) and focal loss. The confidence of the classification is used to screen the false tags of detection frame, which can't reflect the accuracy of localization. RPL [32] multiplies the mean value of classification confidence with the original detection classification confidence as an index which is used to reflect both classification accuracy and localization accuracy.

Based on the dual mining, to boost the tolerance to false pseudo labels, SIOD [33] mines latent instances from fea-




FIGURE 5. Overview of Unbiased teacher.

ture representation space by similarity-based pseudo label generating module (SPLG) and proposes pixel-level group contrastive Learning module (PGCL).

Cross Rectify [34] leverages the disagreements between detectors to discern the self-errors and refines the pseudo label quality by cross-rectifying mechanism.

The MUM method [25] makes mixed input image tiles and reconstructs them in the feature space in SSOD framework.

3) Mean teacher

Mean teacher is widely used in these approaches [24] [30], it contains a teacher model whose weight is obtained from the EMA of the student model and a student model which needs to learn object generated from teacher. Soft teacher [30] proposes an end-to-end semi-supervised object detection method, in order to make full use of the information of the teacher model, the classification loss of the unlabeled bounding box is weighted by the classification score produced by the teacher network. Besides, it selects candidate boxes with box regression variance less than the threshold as pseudo labels for the better learning of box regression. The framework of Soft teacher is shown in Fig. 6.




FIGURE 6. Overview of Soft teacher.

As shown in Fig. 7, Instant-teaching [24] proposes a co-rectify scheme which uses instant pseudo labeling with extended weak-strong data augmentations for teaching during each training iteration.




FIGURE 7. Overview of Instant-teaching.

Label matching [35] introduces a redistribution mean teacher, which leverages adaptive label-distribution-aware confidence thresholds to generate unbiased pseudo labels to drive student learning.

4) Soft labels

Different from the STAC which adopts hard labels, soft labels are applied to Humble teacher [37] which gets the soft label targets from the predicted distribution of the class probabilities and offsets of all possible classes when the head is performing class-dependent bounding box regression. In order to provide more information, Humble teacher uses a large number of regional suggestions and soft pseudo labels as the training target of the student model. The framework of Humble teacher is shown in Fig. 8.




FIGURE 8. Overview of Humble teacher.

5) Dense guidance-based

Dense Learning [22] puts forward adaptive filtering strategy and aggregated teacher for producing stable and precise pseudo-labels, besides, adopts uncertainty-consistency-regularization term among scales and shuffled patches for improving the generalization capability of the detector. The framework of Dense Learning is shown in Fig. 9.




FIGURE 9. Overview of Dense learning.

Dense teacher [38] introduces a region selection technique to highlight the key information while suppressing the noise carried by dense labels. In order to replace sparse pseudo labels with more informative dense supervision, dense teacher guidance (DTG) [39] proposes a novel “dense-to-dense” paradigm which integrates DTG into the student training. It also introduces inverse NMS clustering and rank matching to make student be able to receive sufficient, informative, and dense guidance from the teacher, which naturally leads to better performance.

6) Point labeling

Point labeling can provide the location information of the instance, which greatly saves the labeling time. Under the uni-

fied architecture Omni-DETR [40], different types of weak labels can be leveraged to generate accurate pseudo labels, by a bipartite matching based filtering mechanism. Point DETR [41] extends DETR by adding a point encoder. As shown in Fig. 10, based on the classic R-CNN architecture, the point-to-box regressor Group R-CNN [42] proposes instance-level proposal grouping and instance-level representation learning by instance-aware feature enhancement and instance-aware parameter generation which aims to improve RPN recall and accomplish a one-to-one correspondence from the instance group to the instance box.




FIGURE 10. Overview of Group R-CNN.

7) Uncertainty quantification

Label noise inherently exists in pseudo labels and brings about the uncertainty for SSOD training. There are several approaches to tackle this problem [43]-[45]. The method in literature [43] achieves noise-resistant learning by importing the region uncertainty quantification and promoting multi-peak probability distribution output.

By utilizing the proposed uncertainty quantification as the soft target and facilitating multi-peak probability distribution, as shown in Fig. 11, Combating noise [44] introduces uncertainty into semi-supervised learning.




FIGURE 11. Overall structure of Combating noise.

In order to improve the filtering of the predicted bounding boxes and obtain higher quality on student training, an additional classification model for bounding box localization IL-Net [45] is introduced, utilizing a lightweight branch to predict the bounding box intersection over union (IoU) quality.

Due to the routine training-mining framework introduces various kinds of labelling noises easily, NOTE-RCNN [55]

aims to handle noisy labels is proposed. As shown in Fig. 12, under the large number of image level labels and a few seed box level annotations, the detector uses two classification heads and a distillation head to improve the mining precision, masks the negative sample loss and trains box regression heads only on seed annotations to eliminate the harm from inaccurate information.




FIGURE 12. The diagram of NOTE-RCNN.

8) Data distillation

The method in literature [36] proposes a self-distillation algorithm based on hint learning and ground truth bounded knowledge distillation to utilize purified data. The method in literature [29] is an omni-supervised setting which ensembles predictions from multiple transformations of unlabeled data by a single model, it also retrain the model on the union of the manually labeled data and automatically labeled data.

9) Visual and language model-based

Most prior works on SSOD only leveraged the small set of labeled data for generating pseudo labels, whereas the vision and language models are able to generate pseudo labels for both known and unknown categories.

As shown in Fig. 13, VL-PLM [46] starts with a generic training strategy for object detectors with the unlabeled data. In order to improve the pseudo label localization, it uses the class-agnostic proposal score and the repeated application of the RoI head, besides, provides better pseudo labels with judging the score of cropped regions with the visual and language model.

Prompt Det [47] is able to detect new categories without any manual annotation. As shown in Fig. 14, Prompt Det is divided into 3 stages, in the third stage, the base categories and novel categories are sent into the self-training network, the regional prompt learning is used to generate more accurate pseudo ground truth boxes.




FIGURE 13. Overall structure of VL-PLM.




FIGURE 14. Training process of Prompt det.

B. CONSISTENT REGULARIZATION

The second strategy is based on consistency regularization, as shown in Fig. 15, these methods regularize the consistency of the outputs for the same unlabeled images under different forms of data augmentation. Most of them are based on two-stage anchor-based detector such as Faster-RCNN [52].




FIGURE 15. The process of consistent regularization.

CSD [48] is a typical semi-supervised object detection approach based on uniform regularization, which can work on both one-stage and two-stage detectors. In the first stage, the consistency loss of classification and localization is calculated according to the spatial position of the two images. In the second stage, the same set of RoI is generated by the same RPN for both images to extract features, and then the consistency loss is calculated. The overall structure of CSD is as shown in Fig. 16.

In consistency training, PseCo [49] proposes a multiview scale invariant learning including label-level and feature-level consistency mechanisms, and feature consistency is achieved by aligning and shifting feature pyramids between two images with the same content but different scales.




FIGURE 16. Overall structure of CSD.

ISD [50] applies interpolation regularization to object detection. It proposes different types of interpolation-based loss functions for each type in an unsupervised manner.

C. GRAPH-BASED

The third strategy is graph-based method. The labeled and unlabeled data points can be considered as nodes of a graph, and the objective is to propagate the labels from the labeled nodes to the unlabeled ones by utilizing the similarity of two nodes, which is reflected by how strong the edge between the two nodes.

Graph-based method is an important semi-supervised learning branch in object tracking tasks, which can effectively utilize the comprehensive information of labeled and unlabeled samples. The graph-based method improves tracking accuracy by running graph-based semi-supervised classification methods on each graph independently, thus taking advantage of the intrinsic structural features of the sample set containing labeled as well as unlabeled samples.

The method in literature [53] proposes an online semi-supervised tracking way based on graph. Firstly, all samples are sampled based on the particle filter-based target motion model, and the candidate regions are obtained as unlabeled samples. Then, a component set is constructed for labeled and unlabeled samples, and a graph is constructed for each component set, on which the similarity between the unlabeled samples and labeled samples on the component is obtained by using the graph-based semi-supervised classification method independently. All similarity degrees are fused and unlabeled samples with the highest similarity are used as tracking results.

D. TRANSFER LEARNING-BASED

It is always harder to get the object-level annotation (with category annotations and bounding box annotations) than image-level annotation (with category annotations). Therefore, how to transfer knowledge of existing categories with image annotations and object annotations to those categories without object level annotations is worth exploring. The fourth strategy is based on transfer learning, as shown in Fig. 17, it learns the difference between the two tasks and transfers knowledge of data without bounding box annotations from classifiers to detectors.




FIGURE 17. The diagram of transfer learning.

As shown in Fig. 18, a Large Scale Detection through Adaptation (LSDA) framework [54] is proposed, the algorithm uses the data with image-level annotation and data with object-level annotation to learn the classifier, then it converts the classification network into a detection network by using second kind of data, and finally gets adapted network by putting all the data into networks.




FIGURE 18. The diagram of LSDA framework.

On this basis, the method in literature [56] finds that visual similarity and semantic relatedness are complementary for the detection task. As shown in Fig. 19, similarity-based knowledge transfer model is proposed, it shows how knowledge about object similarities from both visual and semantic domains can be transferred to adapt an image classifier to an object detector in a semi-supervised setting.




FIGURE 19. The diagram of similarity-based knowledge transfer model.

V. CHALLENGING SETTING

In addition to the classical semi-supervised object detection methods mentioned above, some approaches have also been proposed in order to adapt challenging environments.

The VC learning [57] is assigned to each confusing sample such that they can safely contribute to the model optimization even without a concrete label. It also modifies the localization loss to allow high-quality boundaries for location regression. The pipeline of the VC learning is shown in Fig. 20.




FIGURE 20. The diagram of VC learning.

The most SSOD approaches leverage unlabeled data to improve the performance of the detector. However, in fact, the unlabeled data always contain out-of-distribution (OOD) classes. In order to adapt open-set conditions, the open-Set semi-supervised object detection method [58] is proposed, the offline OOD detector based on a self-supervised vision transformer performs well on avoiding interference of pseudo labeling.

Semi-supervised long-tailed recognition is a new research field, the imbalanced data distribution and sample scarcity in its tail classes leads to low detection accuracy. The method in article [59] presents an alternate sampling framework which carries out supervised training and semi-supervised training in an alternate fashion together with model decoupling and different data sampling strategies.

These methods solve the problems in the task of semi-supervised object detection from different dimensions and have a strong reference for future work.

VI. LOSS FUNCTION

According to Section I, after the data augmentation and semi-supervised strategies are used in network, the next step is to design suitable training losses for SSOD. The designed losses have a great impact on what SSOD can learn from the data. In this section, we introduce some widely-used loss functions.

In most SSOD methods, the overall loss is defined as the weighted sum of supervised loss and unsupervised loss, it can be formulated as follows:

$$L = L_x + aL_u. \quad (1)$$

where L_x and L_u denote supervised loss of labeled images and unsupervised loss of unlabeled images respectively, a controls contribution of unsupervised loss. Both of them include classification loss and regression loss.

The losses for classification and localization are often instantiated as a weighted sum of a standard cross-entropy loss and a smooth L1 loss [35] [41] [43]. Other methods select loss functions with different characteristics.

A. SMOOTH L1 LOSS

The method in article [41] introduces the smooth L1 loss for both the supervised localization loss and consistency localization loss. The methods in articles [35] [43] also choose it for regression branch.

B. FOCAL LOSS

To alleviate imbalance issues, methods [17] [31] [39] choose focal loss on the unlabeled data. The method in article [45] sets focal loss for the new branch of IoU classification.

C. SIMILARITY LEARNING LOSS

In method [43], the similarity learning loss function is set up for supervisory signals. The loss of SIOD method [33] consists of a SPLG loss and a PGCL loss, the former focuses on determining latent instance feature similarity between labeled instances and unlabeled region, the latter is designed to boost the tolerance to false pseudo labels.

D. DISTILLATION LOSS

Except the detection training loss, for better performance of multilayer hint for feature adaption, the method in article [37] also uses the knowledge distillation losses, Lkdc and Lkdr are utilized to quantify knowledge between student and teacher detectors in their classification and coordinates outputs.

E. KL DIVERGENCE

Humble teacher [38] calculates KL divergence of the classification probability and bounding box regression output between the student RPN and teacher RPN, the same goes for the RoI phase. Combating Noise [44] utilizes the KL divergence for the classification branch.

F. QUALITY FOCAL LOSS

DPL [38] adopts quality focal loss to conduct learning between dense pseudo labels and the student model's predicting results because it needs to represent information in continuous values.

G. JENSEN-SHANNON DIVERGENCE

In CSD method [48], Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD) is used as the consistency regularization loss for classification, the final loss is composed of the object detector's classification loss, localization loss and consistency loss. The loss of ISD [50] is computed by Type-I loss and Type-II loss, the former uses jensen-shannon divergence as the consistency regularization loss, as for the latter, KL divergence and L2 loss are used as the classification and localization loss. Besides, Dense learning [22] adopts the regularization loss for improving the generalization performance. The overall loss functions of DTG method [39] are classification loss, regression loss and rank matching loss which is adopted to optimize the distance between the score distribution of the teacher and student. omni-DETR [40] puts forward matching cost that encourages the selected predicted box to cover the ground truth point with small geometric distance and high confidence.

VII. DATASETS AND COMPARISON RESULTS

Using challenging datasets as benchmark is significant in object detection task, because they are able to make a stan-

dard comparison between different algorithms. There are now some quality detection datasets in the SSOD field.

MS-COCO [3] dataset is a large-scale image dataset developed and maintained by Microsoft, and the corresponding tasks of dataset labeling types include object detection, key point detection, instance segmentation, stuff segmentation, panoramic segmentation of human key points, human density detection, etc. It contains more than 118k labeled images and 850k labeled object instances from 80 object categories for training. Besides, there are 123k unlabeled images that can be used for semi-supervised learning. The AP metrics of the SOTA methods on this dataset are summarized in the Table 1.

TABLE 1. Semi-supervised object detection results measured by AP50:95 on MS-COCO dataset. The performances are evaluated on the test set. 0.01, 0.02, 0.05 and 0.1 respectively represent the percentage of labeled data

Method	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.1
CSD	10.51±0.06	13.93±0.12	18.63±0.07	22.46±0.08
STAC	13.97±0.35	18.25±0.25	24.38±0.12	28.64±0.21
Unbiased Teacher	20.75±0.12	24.30±0.07	28.27±0.11	31.50±0.10
Instant Teaching	18.05±0.15	22.45±0.30	26.75±0.05	30.40±0.05
Soft Teacher	20.46±0.39	-	30.74±0.08	34.04±0.14
Combating Noise	18.41±0.10	24.00±0.15	28.96±0.29	32.43±0.20
Humble Teacher	16.96±0.38	21.72±0.24	27.70±0.15	31.61±0.28
ISMT	18.88±0.74	22.43±0.56	26.37±0.24	30.52±0.52
MUM	21.88±0.12	24.84±0.10	28.52±0.09	31.87±0.30
Cross Rectify	22.50±0.12	27.60±0.07	32.80±0.05	36.30±0.07
Label Match	25.81±0.28	-	32.70±0.18	35.49±0.17
DTG-SSOD	21.27±0.12	26.84±0.25	31.90±0.08	35.92±0.26
Dense Teacher	22.38±0.31	27.20±0.20	33.01±0.14	37.13±0.12
Dense Learning	22.03±0.28	25.19±0.37	30.87±0.24	36.22±0.18

PASCAL-VOC [3] is made up of VOC07 and VOC12 which is often used for SSOD, there are 4 broad categories of datasets: vehicle, household, animal, and person. The trainval set of VOC07, containing 5011 images from 20 small object categories, it is used as a labeled training datasets. The trainval set of VOC12 contains 11,540 images, it is used as an unlabeled training datasets. The AP metrics of the SOTA methods on PASCAL-VOC dataset are summarized in the Table 2.

TABLE 2. Semi-supervised object detection results measured by AP50 and AP50:95 on PASCAL-VOC dataset. The performances are evaluated on the VOC07 test set

Method	Ap50	Ap50:95
CSD	74.70	-
STAC	77.45	44.64
Unbiased Teacher	77.37	48.69
Instant Teaching	79.20	50.00
Combating Noise	80.60	-
Humble Teacher	80.94	53.04
ISMT	77.23	46.23
MUM	78.94	50.22
Omni-DETR	-	53.40
Cross Rectify	81.56	-
Label Match	85.48	55.11
Dense Teacher	79.89	55.87
Dense Learning	80.70	56.80

VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Both the supervised algorithm and the semi-supervised algorithm can be applied to the object detection task. The supervised algorithm can achieve good performance, but also

has certain limitations, it needs to learn a lot of labeled data and has high requirements on data quality. The semi-supervised algorithm introduced in this paper only requires a small amount of labeled data and a large amount of unlabeled data to improve the quality of the model, which saves the labeling cost in practice. In this paper, we provide a complete review of newly proposed methodologies for semi-supervised object detection in the literature. We categorize the relevant methods based on their fundamental principles and describe their advantages and drawbacks, which may be of interest to practitioners as well as academic researchers. They are perhaps the most intuitive semi-supervised object detection methods, however, they still face many challenges. We make some interesting observations on possible future developments as follows.

A. THE ACCURACY OF PSEUDO LABELS

Self-training-based methods provide a flexibility for further development towards solving semi-supervised learning for object detection. The success of self-training models indicates the possibility of using a single self-training model to learn a representation of unlabeled data and building an intermediate label system to handle insufficient labeling problem in semi-supervision domain. However, the problems of confirmation bias and overly-used pseudo labels are ignored. Improved methods need to explore how to utilize unlabeled data more efficiently, whereas the confirmation bias problems are alleviated and the quality of pseudo labels are improved.

B. FORM OF LABELS

The pseudo label has proven to be effective in SSOD and has achieved state-of-the-art effect on benchmarks like MSCOCO and Pascal VOC. However, the process of generating pseudo labels requires several additional steps, such as NMS, thresholding, and label assignment. Dense guidance-based method is a pioneer work that makes the first step towards a more simple and effective form of pseudo labels. Soft labels coupled with a balanced number of teacher's region proposals are the keys toward superior performance. Point labels-based method can also achieves a better cost-accuracy trade off. So it is useful to set a variety of label forms for obtaining more details of sample.

C. BALANCE OF CATEGORIES

The current SSOD approaches contribute to effectively improving the detection accuracy and the robustness against noisy samples under the balanced data. However, the need for large amounts of balanced labeled data in the training phase is hard to apply in real world scenarios. It is meaningful to take the balance of categories in unlabeled images into account and develop more new resource-friendly semi-supervised object detection methods.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Liu, W. Ouyang, X. Wang, P. Fieguth, J. Chen, X. Liu, and M. Pietikainen, "Deep learning for generic object detection: A survey," *International Journal of Computer Vision.*, vol. 128, pp. 261–318, Feb. 2020.

[2] L. Jiao, F. Zhang, F. Liu, S. Yang, L. Li, Z. Feng, and R. Qu, "A survey of deep learning-based object detection," *IEEE Access.*, vol. 7, pp. 128837–128868, Sep. 2019.

[3] S. Zaidi, M. Ansari, A. Aslam, N. Kanwal, M. Asghar, and Brian Lee, "A survey of modern deep learning based object detection models," *Digital Signal Processing.*, vol. 126, pp. 103514, Jun. 2022.

[4] S. Ding, Z. Zhu, and X. Zhang, "An overview on semi-supervised support vector machine," *Neural Computing & Applications.*, vol. 28, pp. 969–978, May. 2017.

[5] J. van Engelen, H. Hoos, "A survey on semi-supervised learning," *Machine Learning.*, vol. 109, pp. 373–440, Feb. 2020.

[6] X. Yang, Z. Song, I. King and Z. Xu, "A Survey on Deep Semi-Supervised Learning," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering.*, pp. 1–20, Nov. 2022.

[7] A. Oliver, A. Odena, C. Raffel, E. D. Cubuk, and I. J. Goodfellow, "Realistic Evaluation of Deep Semi-Supervised Learning Algorithms," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, NY, USA, 2018, pp. 3239–3250.

[8] Y. Ouali, C. Hudelot, and M. Tami, "An Overview of Deep Semi-Supervised Learning," *arXiv abs/2006.05278*, 2020.

[9] C. Li, K. Xu, J. Zhu, and B. Zhang, "Triple generative adversarial nets," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, California, USA, 2017, pp. 4091–4101.

[10] E. Abbasnejad, A. Dick, and A. den Hengel, "Infinite variational auto-encoder for semi-supervised learning," in *In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Honolulu, HI, USA, 2017, pp. 781–790.

[11] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Inductive representation learning on large graphs," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, California, USA, 2017, pp. 1025–1035.

[12] Z. Wu, S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and S. Philip, "A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems.*, vol. 32, pp. 4–24, Jan. 2021.

[13] T. Miyato, S. Maeda, M. Koyama, and S. Ishii, "Virtual adversarial training: a regularization method for supervised and semi-supervised learning," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence.*, vol. 41, pp. 1979–1993, Aug. 2018.

[14] A. Tarvainen and H. Valpola, "Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results," in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, California, USA, 2017, pp. 1195–1204.

[15] X. Zhai, A. Oliver, A. Kolesnikov, and L. Beyer, "S4: Self-supervised semi-supervised learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, Seoul, Korea(South), 2019, pp. 1476–1485.

[16] Y. Zou, Z. Yu, X. Liu, B. Vijaya Kumar, and J. Wang, "Confidence regularized self-training," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, Seoul, Korea(South), 2019, pp. 5981–5990.

[17] C. Wei, K. Sohn, C. Mellina, A. Yuille, and F. Yang, "Crest: A class-rebalancing self-training framework for imbalanced semi-supervised learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 10852–10861.

[18] X. Wang, D. Kihara, J. Luo, and G. Qi, "EnAET: A self-trained framework for semi-supervised and supervised learning with ensemble transformations," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing.*, vol. 30, pp. 1639–1647, Jan. 2021.

[19] D. Berthelot, N. Carlini, I. Goodfellow, N. Papernot, A. Oliver, and C. Raffel, "Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2019, pp. 5049–5059.

[20] C. Kuo, C. Ma, J. Huang, Z. Kira, G. Tech, and V. Tech, "FeatMatch: Feature-based augmentation for semi-supervised learning," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Glasgow, UK, 2020, pp. 479–495.

[21] K. Sohn, D. Berthelot, C. Li, Z. Zhang, N. Carlini, E. Cubuk, A. Kurakin, H. Zhang, and C. Raffel, "FixMatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, California, USA, 2020, pp. 596–608.

[22] B. Chen, P. Li, X. Chen, B. Wang, L. Zhang, and X. Hua, "Dense Learning based Semi-Supervised Object Detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 4805–4814.

[23] F. Zhang, T. Pan, and B. Wang, "Semi-supervised object detection with adaptive class-rebalancing self-training," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Con-*

- ference on Artificial Intelligence, Palo Alto, California, USA, 2022, pp. 3252–3261.
- [24] Q. Zhou, C. Yu, Z. Wang, Q. Qian, and H. Li, “Instant-teaching: An end-to-end semi-supervised object detection framework,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Palo Alto, California, USA, 2021, pp. 4081–4090.
- [25] J. Kim, J. Jang, S. Seo, J. Jeong, J. Na, and N. Kwak, “MUM: Mix Image Tiles and UnMix Feature Tiles for Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 14492–14501.
- [26] K. Sohn, Z. Zhang, C. Li, H. Zhang, C. Lee, and T. Pfister, “A simple semi-supervised learning framework for object detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04757*, 2020.
- [27] B. Zoph, G. Ghiasi, T. Lin, Y. Cui, H. Liu, E. Cubuk, and Q. Le, “Rethinking pre-training and self-training,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2020, pp. 3833–3845.
- [28] Q. Yang, X. Wei, B. Wang, X. Hua, and L. Zhang, “Interactive self-training with mean teachers for semi-supervised object detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 5937–5946.
- [29] I. Radosavovic, P. Dollar, R. Girshick, G. Gkioxari, and K. He, “Data distillation: Towards omni-supervised learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 2018, pp. 4119–4128.
- [30] M. Xu, Z. Zhang, H. Hu, J. Wang, L. Wang, F. Wei, X. Bai, and Z. Liu, “End-to-end semi-supervised object detection with soft teacher,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, Montreal, QC, Canada, 2021, pp. 3040–3049.
- [31] Y. Liu, C. Ma, Z. He, C. Kuo, K. Chen, P. Zhang, B. Wu, Z. Kira, and P. Vajda, “Unbiased teacher for semi-supervised object detection,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [32] H. Li, Z. Wu, A. Shrivastava, and L. Davis, “Rethinking pseudo labels for semi-supervised object detection,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Palo Alto, California, USA, 2022, pp. 1314–1322.
- [33] H. Li, X. Pan, K. Yan, F. Tang, and W. Zheng, “SIOD: Single Instance Annotated Per Category Per Image for Object Detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 14177–14186.
- [34] C. Ma, X. Pan, Q. Ye, F. Tang, W. Dong, and C. Xu, “CrossRectify: Leveraging Disagreement for Semi-supervised Object Detection,” *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 137, pp. 109280, Jan. 2022.
- [35] B. Chen, W. Chen, S. Yang, Y. Xuan, J. Song, D. Xie, S. Pu, M. Song, and Y. Zhuang, “Label Matching Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 14361–14370.
- [36] J. Guo, K. Han, H. Wu, C. Zhang, X. Chen, C. Xu and Y. Wang, “Positive-Unlabeled Data Purification in the Wild for Object Detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 14177–14186.
- [37] Y. Tang, W. Chen, Y. Luo, and Y. Zhang, “Humble teachers teach better students for semi-supervised object detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 2652–2661.
- [38] H. Zhou, Z. Ge, S. Liu, W. Mao, Z. Li, H. Yu, and J. Sun, “Dense teacher: Dense pseudo-labels for semi-supervised object detection,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Tel Aviv, Israel, 2022, pp. 35–50.
- [39] G. Li, X. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Wu, D. Liang, and S. Zhang, “DTG-SSOD: Dense Teacher Guidance for Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *Conference and Workshop on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [40] P. Wang, Z. Cai, H. Yang, G. Swaminathan, N. Vasconcelos, B. Schiele, and S. Soatto, “Omni-DETR: Omni-Supervised Object Detection with Transformers,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 9357–9366.
- [41] L. Chen, T. Yang, X. Zhang, W. Zhang, and J. Sun, “Points as queries: Weakly semi-supervised object de-tection by points,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 8819–8828.
- [42] S. Zhang, Z. Y. L. Liu, X. Wang, A. Zhou, and K. Chen, “Group R-CNN for Weakly Semi-supervised Object Detection with Points,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2022, pp. 9407–9416.
- [43] Z. Wang, Y. Li, Y. Guo, L. Fang, and S. Wang, “Data-uncertainty guided multi-phase learning for semi-supervised object detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 4566–4575.
- [44] Z. Wang, Y. Li, Y. Guo, and S. Wang, “Combating Noise: Semi-supervised Learning by Region Uncertainty Quantification,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [45] L. Rossi, A. Karimi, and A. Prati, “Improving Localization for Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *International Conference on Image Analysis and Processing*, Lecce, Italy, 2022, pp. 516–527.
- [46] S. Zhao, Z. Zhang, S. Schuler, L. Zhao, V. B.G. A. Stathopoulos, M. Chandraker, and D. Metaxas, “Exploiting unlabeled data with vision and language models for object detection,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Tel Aviv, Israel, 2022, pp. 159–175.
- [47] C. Feng, Y. Zhong, Z. Jie, X. Chu, H. Ren, X. Wei, W. Xie, and L. Ma, “Promptdet: Towards open-vocabulary detection using uncurated images,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Tel Aviv, Israel, 2022, pp. 701–717.
- [48] J. Jeong, S. Lee, J. Kim, and N. Kwak, “Consistency-based semi-supervised learning for object detection,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2019, pp. 10759–10768.
- [49] G. Li, X. Li, Y. Wang, and Y. Wu, “PseCo: Pseudo Labeling and Consistency Training for Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Tel Aviv, Israel, 2022, pp. 457–472.
- [50] J. Jeong, V. Verma, M. Hyun, J. nala, and N. Kwak, “Interpolation-based Semi-supervised Learning for Object Detection,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Nashville, TN, USA, 2021, pp. 11597–11606.
- [51] C. Chen, S. Dong, Y. Tian, K. Cao, L. Liu, and Y. Guo, “Temporal self-ensembling teacher for semi-supervised object detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 24, pp. 3679–3692, Aug. 2021.
- [52] S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, and J. Sun, “Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 39, pp. 1137–1149, Jun. 2017.
- [53] M. Dun, X. Chang-feng, L. Tie-bing, and H. Ao-ling, “Graph-based semi-supervised learning for object tracking,” *Systems Engineering and Electronics*, Feb. 2016.
- [54] J. Hoffman, S. Guadarrama, E. Tzeng, R. Hu, J. Donahue, R. Girshick, T. Darrell, and K. Saenko, “LSDA: Large scale detection through adaptation,” in *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- [55] J. Gao, J. Wang, S. Dai, L. Li, and R. Nevatia, “Note-rcnn: Noise tolerant ensemble rcnn for semi-supervised object detection,” in *In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, Seoul, Korea(South), 2019, pp. 9507–9516.
- [56] Y. Tang, J. Wang, B. Gao, E. Dellandréa, R. Gaizauskas and L. Chen, “Large Scale Semi-Supervised Object Detection Using Visual and Semantic Knowledge Transfer,” in *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Las Vegas, NV, USA, 2016, pp. 2119–2128.
- [57] C. Chen, K. Debattista, and J. Han, “Semi-supervised object detection via virtual category learning,” in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, Cham, 2022, pp. 169–185.
- [58] Y. Liu, C. Ma, X. Dai, J. Tian, P. Vajda, Z. He, and Z. Kira, “Open-Set Semi-Supervised Object Detection,” in *In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer, Cham, 2022, pp. 143–159.
- [59] B. Liu, H. Li, H. Kang, N. Vasconcelos, and G. Hua, “Semi-supervised long-tailed recognition using alternate sampling,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

•••