

# Knowledge Fused Recognition: Fusing Hierarchical Knowledge for Image Recognition through Quantitative Relativity Modeling and Deep Metric Learning

Yunfeng Zhao, Huiyu Zhou, Fei Wu, Xifeng Wu

**Abstract**—Image recognition is an essential baseline for deep metric learning. Hierarchical knowledge about image classes depicts inter-class similarities or dissimilarities. Effective fusion of hierarchical knowledge about image classes to enhance image recognition remains a challenging topic to advance. In this paper, we propose a novel deep metric learning based method to effectively fuse hierarchical prior knowledge about image classes and enhance image recognition performances in an end-to-end supervised regression manner. Existing deep metric learning incorporated image classification mainly exploits qualitative relativity between image classes, i.e., whether sampled images are from the same class. A new triplet loss function term that exploits quantitative relativity and aligns distances in model latent space with those in knowledge space is also proposed and incorporated in the proposed dual-modality fusion method. Experimental results indicate that the proposed method enhanced image recognition performances and outperformed baseline and existing methods on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, Mini-ImageNet, and ImageNet-1K datasets.

**Index Terms**—Fusion, image recognition, deep metric learning, quantitative relativity modeling.

## I. INTRODUCTION

As an essential baseline for deep metric learning [1], image classification attempts to correctly recognize the belonging category of an image. Object localization attempts to accurately identify the target object in the image [2]. Large-scale image classification extends the number of image classes to hundreds and thousands which motivates advancements in modeling methods [3]. A range of deep learning based backbone models such as Convolutional Neural Networks [4], [5], [6] and Vision Transformers [7], [8] have been proposed and achieved remarkable classification performance on large-scale image datasets such as ImageNet [9].

The sense of distance has been adopted in classification. For instance, nearest neighbor methods select the closest training data from test data in terms of a distance metric such as Euclidean distance [10]. In metric learning, distance measurements with learnable weights such as Mahalanobis and bilinear are considered in the modeling process. Deep metric learning incorporates metric losses such as contrastive and




Fig. 1. Learning approaches of image classification illustrated. (a) Baseline image classification based on deep learning employs cross-entropy loss and gathers samples to the class centers. (b) Deep metric learning incorporated image classification that exploits qualitative relativity pulls latent representations of similar samples together while pushing those of dissimilar samples apart. (c) The proposed method fuses semantic prior knowledge about image classes to baseline image classification models in an end-to-end regression manner by quantitative relativity modeling and deep metric learning.

triplet losses and mainly exploits discriminativity to pull closer latent representations of similar samples and push apart those of dissimilar samples [11], [12], [13]. Metric and deep metric learning have been incorporated with image classification modeling to improve recognition performance [14], [2].

However, the loss function terms in current deep metric learning incorporated image classification methods mostly exploit discriminativity [2], [15] (or qualitative relativity [16]) which leaves out potentially valuable quantitative similarity and dissimilarity information about image classes and could contain a margin term [16]. A margin term usually needs to be tuned depending on the specific learning tasks and can be hard to determine. A loss function term that is capable of fusing valuable quantitative information with image classification can potentially enhance classification performance as well as simplify the deep metric learning modeling process.

Hierarchical knowledge such as category trees and semantic

Y. Zhao and X. Wu are with the Department of Big Data in Health Science, Zhejiang University. E-mail: zyfcc@126.com; xifengw@zju.edu.cn

H. Zhou is with the School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, University of Leicester, United Kingdom. E-mail: hz143@leicester.ac.uk

F. Wu is with the College of Computer Science and Technology, Zhejiang University. E-mail: wufei@cs.zju.edu.cn

hierarchies about image classes captures inter-class similarities or dissimilarities in either image feature, instance, or class level [17], [18]. It is a potentially valuable source of context information that could help improve image classification performance [19]. Effective fusion of hierarchical knowledge with image classification in an end-to-end manner remains a challenge. The major current approach to conduct such incorporation is through constructing a corresponding tree-shaped hierarchical classifiers that performs multiple classification steps to find the best path to make the prediction [19], [17], [3].

In this paper, we propose and present a novel method that fuses hierarchical prior knowledge about image classes to enhance image recognition through quantitative relativity modeling and deep metric learning, namely, Knowledge Fused Recognition (KFR). Compared to the major existing image classification modeling approaches shown in Fig. 1, the proposed method can more effectively fuse hierarchical knowledge about image classes by quantitative relativity modeling and deep metric learning. The proposed method works in an end-to-end supervised regression manner and can produce image classification models that more accurately localize target objects in the recognized images. The major contributions of this work are summarized below:

- 1) A new triplet loss function term that exploits quantitative relativity and aligns distances in the model latent space with distances in the hierarchical knowledge space is proposed to model knowledge fusion. The proposed loss prevents a margin term.
- 2) Effective fusion of hierarchical semantic knowledge about image classes for image recognition is achieved in an end-to-end manner by the proposed method.
- 3) Experiments have been conducted to evaluate the proposed method on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, Mini-ImageNet, and ImageNet-1K datasets. Results demonstrate that the proposed method outperformed major existing methods on small- and medium-scale image classification tasks and tremendously improved weakly-supervised object localization performance.

## II. RELATED WORKS

An image classification model based on deep learning typically recognizes image classes by minimizing the error of predicting the correct classes [6], [8]. The learning process trains a model that makes the classes separable [11], [20].

Manhattan and Euclidean, special cases of Minkowski and also known as  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  distance, are basic distance metrics [16]. Common distance metrics in metric learning include cosine similarity [16], Mahalanobis [21], Kullback-Leibler Divergence [22], etc.

Existing supervised deep metric learning methods for image classification tasks have been mainly exploiting discriminativity [15], [11], [20] (or qualitative relativity [16], [23]) in image feature [24] or class [15], [20], [21], [23] level. Contrastive [15], triplet [25], [23], or quadruplet [24] losses have been incorporated into these deep metric learning methods.

Several works also employed contrastive loss with self-supervised [26], [27], [28] or unsupervised learning [2], [29],

[30] to improve model latent representation and performance of visual tasks. Xie et al. [2] proposed an object localization method by exploiting cross-image foreground-background contrast and employed a contrastive loss to learn disentangled representations of foreground objects. In their work, the learned foreground object representation refined the original class activation mapping (CAM) visualization result [2].

Data fusion attempts to create proper interactions, either through soft or hard links, between datasets with various modalities [31].

Contextual knowledge has various types and forms and can be fused with image classification in multiple ways. Objects and the surrounding environment in the image to be classified can be identified to improve classification performance [32], [33]. Graph embedding of objects/features in the image to be classified can also improve image classification performance [34], [35]. Another way of integrating contextual knowledge with image classification is through dense embedding and fusion of textual and semantic knowledge about image features in language models [36], [37], [38], [39]. Hierarchical semantic knowledge is a type of hierarchical knowledge and structured data [15], [17]. It provides contextual knowledge about image classes and has been incorporated with image classification.

To incorporate hierarchical knowledge and enhance image classification performance, multiple works constructed classifiers with the corresponding tree structure [15], [19], [18], [17], [3]. Waltner et al. [40] incorporated hierarchical semantic knowledge into image classification through a coarse-to-fine strategy which trains coarse embeddings as well as sets of corresponding fine embeddings. They also applied deep metric learning to refine the embedding spaces.

Few works fused hierarchical knowledge with image classification. Kim et al. [41] mapped model latent space to a low-dimensional hyperbolic space and employed hyperbolic distance metric and deep metric learning to construct semantic hierarchy by clustering and to fuse the hierarchy with model latent space. This method calculates the lowest common ancestors of pairing samples as proxies in addition to the sampled triplets. Deng et al. [14] employed bilinear similarity and defined a quantitative hierarchical precision measurement to learn a correspondence between distances in image features and hierarchical semantic knowledge for image retrieval by metric learning. The proposed method in this paper fuses hierarchical knowledge for image recognition in an end-to-end supervised regression manner that can be performed with high-dimensional model latent representation and arbitrary triplet sampling.

## III. PROPOSED METHODS

In this section, the proposed deep metric learning and quantitative relativity modeling incorporated KFR method that fuses hierarchical prior knowledge about image classes with image classification is presented. In contrast with most existing deep metric learning methods that optimize model latent space by discriminativity or qualitative relativity in image classification, the proposed method exploits quantitative relativity

and aligns distance in the model latent space with distance in the knowledge embedding space in an end-to-end regression manner.

In general, the KFR method learns a model latent representation whose sample-class distance is aligned with that of the knowledge embedding space in a regression process.

The hierarchical prior knowledge embedding space has the form of a tree structure  $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ , where  $v \in V$  is a node/leaf denoting a class and  $e \in E$  is a weighted edge denoting pseudo-distance between a node/leaf and its parent node.  $\mathcal{T}$  is associated with a distance transformation function  $f_e : E \rightarrow E'$  that maps the pseudo-distances to the real distances in the knowledge embedding space. The knowledge tree  $\mathcal{T}$  incorporates hierarchical prior knowledge about image classes. And it can be processed to produce a symmetric pseudo-distance matrix with zero-diagonal  $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ , namely a prior matrix in [14], that depicts inter-class distances.

Assume an image dataset  $\mathcal{X} = \{(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_i^n$  of  $n$  samples with corresponding image class label  $\mathbf{y}, \forall \mathbf{y} \in V$ , a deep image classification model for the image classification task obtains the model latent vector in the latent space  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  by an image feature extractor  $Extract(\mathbf{X})$ , and further produces the prediction result by a classifier  $MLP(\mathbf{z})$ .

#### A. Distance metrics

Since the latent representation of a deep model could reach thousands in dimensionality, conventional metrics such as Euclidean and cosine similarity have become limited in quantifying distances in the model latent and hierarchical knowledge embedding space to be aligned. Thereby, two distance metrics are defined in this work. The first metric measures distance in the hierarchical knowledge embedding space, and the other quantifies distance in the model latent space.

A distance metric of hierarchical semantic knowledge space that exploits quantitative relativity, namely hierarchical precision, has been defined in [14] for metric learning. It is calculated as the ratio between the height of the lowest common ancestor node to the tree root and the height of the tree.

In this work, distance between two classes,  $v^a$  and  $v^b$ , in the hierarchical knowledge embedding space is measured by a newly proposed pseudo-distance metric. The metric measures the shortest distance between the corresponding tree nodes/leafs of the two classes transformed by the distance transformation function, denoted by:

$$d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^b) = f_e\left(\sum \mathbf{e}\right), \forall \mathbf{e} \in E \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}$  is the edge distances of the tree edges need to be traveled between two measured nodes.

A constant pseudo-distance value  $k$  was assigned to all the weighted edges in the knowledge tree.

The latent distance metric is defined to measure distance in the model latent space. Normalization has been performed with numeral existing distance metrics such as cosine similarity. In the defined latent distance metric, the model latent vector  $\mathbf{z}$  is initially normalized in terms of its mean  $\mu$  and standard derivation  $\sigma$  to reduce vector magnitude information. The

normalization is similar to Batch normalization [42] which replaces the standard derivation with a variance term. Then,  $L_1$  distance between two normalized latent vectors,  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^a$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^b$ , is calculated as the distance metric of two latent vectors in the model latent space.

The defined metrics satisfy the nonnegativity, identity of indiscernibles, symmetry, and triangle inequality distance axioms.

#### B. Quantitative relativity modeling incorporated deep metric learning

In this work, the KFR method that exploits quantitative relativity to fuse hierarchical knowledge with image classification is proposed. Fig. 2 demonstrates the overall pipeline.

The proposed method randomly samples an anchor and two pairing samples from the dataset  $\mathcal{X}$  to form the triplet  $\mathcal{P} = \{(\mathbf{X}_i^a, \mathbf{y}_i^a), (\mathbf{X}_i^b, \mathbf{y}_i^b), (\mathbf{X}_i^c, \mathbf{y}_i^c)\}_i^n$ , where  $(\mathbf{X}^a, \mathbf{y}^a)$  is the anchor,  $(\mathbf{X}^b, \mathbf{y}^b)$  and  $(\mathbf{X}^c, \mathbf{y}^c)$  are the pairing samples.

In the proposed method, feature extractor with nonlinear activation is employed to enable nonlinear mapping  $g$  from the image data to the model latent space, denoted by:

$$\mathbf{z} = g_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (2)$$

A classifier  $h$  is integrated to make the predictions:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = h_{\omega}(\mathbf{z}) \quad (3)$$

The proposed KFR method trains the model weights  $\omega$  of the feature extractor with nonlinear activation and produces a model latent space that satisfies the distance alignment criteria in terms of the model latent and pseudo-distance metrics defined in Section III-A, denoted by:

$$d^z(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^b) = \lambda d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^b) \quad (4)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a constant scaling factor.

Since the scaling factor  $\lambda$  is assumed to be a constant, the distance alignment criteria in Equation 4 can be further derived to formulate Equation 5 by considering the other pairing sample in the triplet:

$$\frac{d^z(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^b)^T}{d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^b)} = \frac{d^z(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^c)^T}{d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^c)} \quad (5)$$

Based on this setting, a new quantitative-relativity loss  $\mathcal{L}_{qtr}$  with the triplet form is proposed to fuse hierarchical prior knowledge with image classification. The quantitative-relativity triplet loss can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{qtr}(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^b, \mathbf{z}^c) &= \ell_{qtr}(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^c, \mathbf{z}^b) \\ &= \|d^z(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^b)^T d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^c) - d^z(\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^c)^T d^{\mathcal{T}}(v^a, v^b)\|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}^a$  is the anchor. Switching positions of  $\mathbf{z}^b$  and  $\mathbf{z}^c$  will produce identical result. All the inputs of the quantitative-relativity triplet loss can be sampled from arbitrary classes.

A merit of the proposed quantitative-relativity triplet loss is that it prevents a margin term.




Fig. 2. The overall pipeline of the proposed method is illustrated by using a single triplet as an example. The initial step samples the triplet. The following step calculates pseudo-distances between sample classes in the knowledge tree. The third step applies image feature extraction and produces the latent representations. In the next step, distances between sample latent representations are measured, and quantitative-relativity loss is employed to fuse hierarchical knowledge and optimize feature extractor model weights. At the same time, classifier weights are optimized by employing a cross-entropy loss.

The objective function of the learning can be written as:

$$\min_{\omega} (\ell_{ce}(\hat{y}^a, y^a) + \alpha \cdot (\ell_{qtr}(z^a, z^b, z^c))) \quad (7)$$

where  $\ell_{ce}$  denotes the cross-entropy loss term between the predicted and corresponding label values,  $\alpha$  is the weighting hyperparameter of the quantitative-relativity loss term.

Note that the scalar part of the constant pseudo-distance value  $k$  defined in Section III-A can be extracted and combined with the weighting hyperparameter  $\alpha$ .

The objective function defined in Equation 7 can be extended to contain more than one cross-entropy and quantitative-relativity loss terms by switching the positions of the anchor and pairing samples.

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, classification and weakly-supervised object localization performances of the proposed method were evaluated by numeral image datasets and compared with baselines and major existing methods.

### A. Datasets

Four image datasets with general image categories, i.e., CIFAR-10 [43], CIFAR-100 [43], Mini-ImageNet [44], and ImageNet-1K [9] were used to evaluate the proposed KFR method. The CIFAR-10 dataset consists of 10 general image classes with 6,000 images of  $32 \times 32$  in size. The CIFAR-100 dataset contains a hundred image classes with each class containing 600 images of the same size. The number of image classes scales up to a thousand in the ImageNet-1K dataset, with each class containing approximately 1,300 images of around 300 pixels in the shorter edge. The Mini-ImageNet dataset is a subset of ImageNet-1K and also contains a hundred

image classes. The number of images per class in the Mini-ImageNet dataset is around 1,800, and the images are with similar sizes as those in the ImageNet-1K.

The hierarchical knowledge tree of image classes used in this work was produced by ImageNet [9] based on WordNet synsets [45]. WordNet is a lexical database for English constructed by human experts. It contains interlinked words and concepts to form semantic prior knowledge.

Dataset preparation, preprocessing, model architecture, training settings, and evaluation metrics are illustrated in supplementary.

### B. Dataset preparation and preprocessing

In this work, image classes in the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets were manually mapped with the closest corresponding classes in the semantic knowledge tree to enable the conducting of the proposed method on the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. A constant 1.0 was assigned to the pseudo-distance  $k$  in the knowledge tree. A pseudo-distance matrix  $D^T$  was constructed based on the semantic knowledge tree to accelerate the training process.

Training and validation splitting remained original as it was in CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet-1K datasets. In the Mini-ImageNet dataset, the splitting was performed according to the 80/20 percentage ratio.

### C. Model architectures

The backbone model architectures of image feature extractor deployed in experiments were Convolutional Vision Transformer (CvT) [7], ResNet [4], and Wide ResNet (WRResNet) [46]. A random dropout [47] probability of 15% was applied to CvTs during training to enhance model generosity. The standard ResNet-34 was selected as the model architecture to evaluate the CIFAR-100 dataset. The standard WRResNet-50

and WResnet-101 architectures and their pretrained weights were selected to evaluate modeling performance on the Mini-ImageNet and ImageNet-1K datasets, respectively. Each of these feature extractors was connected with an MLP (fully-connected) layer to produce the classification predictions.

#### D. Training settings

The CvT and ResNet-34 model weights were trained from scratch. A two-phase training procedure was applied. Firstly, the model was trained only by cross-entropy loss for fast convergence. Then, the evaluated method was brought into the training process to finalize the training. To avoid potential local optima at the end of each model training, an initial learning rate of 1E-3 and an ending learning rate of 1E-4 were assigned to the optimizer.

The WResNet model weights were pretrained on ImageNet and fine-tuned on the target image dataset by applying the evaluated method. A constant learning rate of 1E-5 was applied for model fine-tuning.

Since all the datasets are mostly balanced according to the image classes, random sampling of the triplet anchor and pairs in the proposed KFR method was performed with equal probability. The hyperparameter  $\alpha$  of the proposed method was set to 30.0, 30.0, 1.0, and 100.0 for CvT, ResNet-34, WResNet-50, and WResNet-101 models, respectively.

The AdamW [48] optimizer was applied in all the training. A standard data augmentation scheme consisting of sequential operations including image resizing to  $64 \times 64$  for CIFAR datasets and  $224 \times 224$  for Mini-ImageNet and ImageNet-1K datasets, random horizontal flipping, random rotation, and random resized cropping was applied to the training image data. The CvT models were trained with Sharpness-Aware Minimization (SAM) [49] to perform distribution smoothing. A batch size of 20 was used for the ImageNet-1K dataset and that of 32 for the other datasets.

1) *Evaluation metrics*: Top-1 classification accuracy ( $100\% \times \text{Correct}/\text{Total}$ ) produced in validation was considered as the evaluation metric of classification performance. Validation was performed after each training epoch. Classification accuracies produced from the last five epochs after finishing model training were averaged to indicate classification performance.

*MaxBoxAccV2* [50] was selected as the evaluation metric to measure Top-1 object localization accuracy. It is formulated as:

$$\text{MaxBoxAccV2}(\tau, \delta) = 100\% \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{IoU(\hat{B}(\mathbf{x}_i, \tau), B^i) \geq \delta} \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{B}(\mathbf{x}_i, \tau)$  are the estimated bounding boxes with activation map threshold  $\tau$  set to be 0.15,  $B$  denotes ground truth bounding boxes of target objects in each recognized image,  $\delta$  is the intersection proportion threshold between  $\hat{B}$  and  $B$  and was set to be 0.3.

#### E. Experimental results




Fig. 3. Classification accuracies produced by applying varied  $\alpha$  hyperparameter values.

1) *Effectiveness evaluations of the proposed method*: The effectiveness of the proposed method was evaluated by comparing the classification and weakly-supervised object localization accuracies of the baselines and the corresponding models produced by applying the proposed method evaluated on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, Mini-ImageNet, and ImageNet-1K datasets. As indicated in Table I, the proposed KFR method improved image classification accuracy in small- and medium-scale image classification tasks. Evaluation results on the ImageNet-1K dataset indicate that the proposed method produced lower classification accuracy (79.5% compared to 81.2%) while tremendously enhanced weakly-supervised object localization accuracy from 50.4% to 75.6% compared to the baseline.

2) *Evaluation of the alpha hyperparameter*: Fig. 3 presents classification accuracies produced by applying the proposed method with the  $\alpha$  hyperparameter value set to be 0.0, 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, and 30.0. The evaluation was performed using the ResNet-34 model and the CIFAR-100 dataset. Results demonstrate a strong positive correlation between the evaluated  $\alpha$  values and produced classification accuracies.




Fig. 4. Randomly sampled Grad-CAM visualizations on the Mini-ImageNet. The first lines are the randomly sampled original images, followed by the corresponding Grad-CAM visualizations produced from without (baseline) and with applying the proposed method.

3) *CAM visualization*: To examine the learned features, Gradient-weighted CAM (Grad-CAM) [51] visualizations were produced. Fig. 4 demonstrates the Grad-CAMs produced from WResNet models trained on the Mini-ImageNet dataset. Compared to the baseline model, the model trained by the proposed method tremendously improved target object identi-



Model	Target dataset	Task	Baseline accuracy	Accuracy by KFR
CvT	CIFAR-10	Classification	90.8	<b>92.6</b>
ResNet-34	CIFAR-100	Classification	61.4	<b>62.3</b>
WResNet-50*	Mini-ImageNet	Classification	95.6	<b>96.6</b>
WResNet-101*	ImageNet-1K	Classification	<b>81.2</b>	79.5
WResNet-101*	ImageNet-1K	WSOL	50.4	<b>75.6</b>

\* indicates baseline model weights pretrained on ImageNet.

TABLE I

CLASSIFICATION AND WEAKLY-SUPERVISED OBJECT LOCALIZATION (WSOL) ACCURACIES COMPARED BETWEEN BASELINE AND CORRESPONDING FINE-TUNED MODELS PRODUCED BY APPLYING THE PROPOSED METHOD.

fication and localization in the classified images.

Method	Classification accuracy
C <sup>2</sup> AM [2]	60.8
InfoNCE loss [30]	57.4
Contrastive ( $L_1$ ) loss	60.8
Contrastive ( $L_2$ ) loss	60.9
Triplet ( $L_1$ ) loss	61.2
Triplet ( $L_2$ ) loss	59.9
Proposed KFR	<b>62.3</b>

TABLE II

CLASSIFICATION ACCURACY OF THE PROPOSED METHOD COMPARED WITH MAJOR EXISTING DEEP METRIC LEARNING INCORPORATED METHODS.

4) *Benchmark and discussions:* The following experiment compares the proposed method with major existing deep metric learning methods by using the ResNet-34 and CIFAR-100 datasets. In Table II, comparison results demonstrate that the proposed method outperformed the major existing deep metric learning methods including self-supervised/unsupervised C<sup>2</sup>AM and InfoNCE loss as well as those supervised methods that employed marginal contrastive or triplet losses with  $L_1$  or  $L_2$  distance in terms of classification accuracy. Contrastive loss methods were performed with equal sampling probabilities as used in the proposed method.

The proposed method altered features captured by the model as can be visualized in Fig. 4 and tremendously improved weakly-supervised object localization accuracy. This is an advancement of the proposed method in addition to classification accuracy. Results of the evaluations indicate that hierarchical semantic knowledge could be valuable prior to improving image recognition performances together with performing the proposed method.

## V. SUMMARY

We have proposed and presented a novel method based on quantitative relativity modeling and deep metric learning to fuse hierarchical semantic knowledge about image classes for image recognition. The proposed method incorporates a new triplet loss function term which is simple yet effective in aligning distance in the model latent space with distance in the hierarchical knowledge space by quantitative relativity modeling and deep metric learning in an end-to-end manner. Experimental results indicate the effectiveness of the proposed method on improving image classification accuracy evaluated on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Mini-ImageNet datasets, as well as a tremendous performance enhancement on object

localization accuracy visually and quantitatively evaluated on the Mini-ImageNet and ImageNet-1K datasets, respectively.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Zhai and H.-Y. Wu, "Classification is a strong baseline for deep metric learning," in *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2019.
- [2] J. Xie, J. Xiang, J. Chen, X. Hou, X. Zhao, and L. Shen, "C2 am: Contrastive learning of class-agnostic activation map for weakly supervised object localization and semantic segmentation," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 979–988.
- [3] M. Sun, W. Huang, and S. Savarese, "Find the best path: An efficient and accurate classifier for image hierarchies," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2013, pp. 265–272.
- [4] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [5] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2012.
- [6] Y. Lecun, B. Boser, J. Denker, D. Henderson, R. Howard, W. Hubbard, and L. Jackel, "Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition," *Neural Computation*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 541–551, 1989.
- [7] H. Wu, B. Xiao, N. Codella, M. Liu, X. Dai, L. Yuan, and L. Zhang, "Cvt: Introducing convolutions to vision transformers," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 22–31.
- [8] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [9] O. Russakovsky *et al.*, "Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 115, no. 3, pp. 211–252, 2015.
- [10] S. Marsland, *Machine learning: an algorithmic perspective*, 2nd ed. CRC Press, 2015.
- [11] B. Liu, R. Li, and J. Feng, "A brief introduction to deep metric learning," *CAAI Transactions on Intelligent Systems*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 1064–1072, 2019.
- [12] K. Song, J. Han, G. Cheng, J. Lu, and F. Nie, "Adaptive neighborhood metric learning," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 4591–4604, 2022.
- [13] M. Kaya and H. Bilge, "Deep metric learning: A survey," *Symmetry*, vol. 11, no. 9, 2019.
- [14] J. Deng, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei, "Hierarchical semantic indexing for large scale image retrieval," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2011, pp. 785–792.
- [15] W. Zheng, Y. Huang, B. Zhang, J. Zhou, and J. Lu, "Dynamic metric learning with cross-level concept distillation," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2022, pp. 197–213.
- [16] A. Bellet, A. Habrard, and M. Sebban, "Metric learning," vol. 30. Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2015, pp. 1–151.
- [17] Y. Qu, L. Lin, F. Shen, C. Lu, Y. Wu, Y. Xie, and D. Tao, "Joint hierarchical category structure learning and large-scale image classification," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 4331–4346, 2017.
- [18] X. Ma, H. Wang, Y. Liu, S. Ji, Q. Gao, and J. Wang, "Knowledge guided classification of hyperspectral image based on hierarchical class tree," in *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, 2019, pp. 2702–2705.

- [19] Y. Zheng, J. Fan, J. Zhang, and X. Gao, "Exploiting related and unrelated tasks for hierarchical metric learning and image classification," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 883–896, 2020.
- [20] Y. Wen, K. Zhang, Z. Li, and Y. Qiao, "A discriminative feature learning approach for deep face recognition," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer International Publishing, 2016, pp. 499–515.
- [21] B. Kulis, "Metric learning: A survey," *Foundations and trends in machine learning*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 287–364, 2013.
- [22] S. Ji, Z. Zhang, S. Ying, L. Wang, X. Zhao, and Y. Gao, "Kullback-leibler divergence metric learning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2047–2058, 2022.
- [23] M. G. Schultz and T. Joachims, "Learning a Distance Metric from Relative Comparisons," *Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 16, pp. 41–48, 12 2003.
- [24] M. T. Law, N. Thome, and M. Cord, "Learning a distance metric from relative comparisons between quadruplets of images," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 121, no. 1, pp. 65–94, 2017.
- [25] T. Endo and M. Matsumoto, "Aurora image classification with deep metric learning," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 17, 2022.
- [26] D. Wu, S. Li, Z. Zang, and S. Z. Li, "Exploring localization for self-supervised fine-grained contrastive learning," in *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2022.
- [27] E. Xie, J. Ding, W. Wang, X. Zhan, H. Xu, P. Sun, Z. Li, and P. Luo, "Detco: Unsupervised contrastive learning for object detection," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 8372–8381.
- [28] F. Haghghi, M. R. H. Taher, M. B. Gotway, and J. Liang, "Dira: Discriminative, restorative, and adversarial learning for self-supervised medical image analysis," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 20 792–20 802.
- [29] K. He, H. Fan, Y. Wu, S. Xie, and R. Girshick, "Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 9726–9735.
- [30] Z. Wu, Y. Xiong, S. X. Yu, and D. Lin, "Unsupervised feature learning via non-parametric instance discrimination," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 3733–3742.
- [31] D. Lahat, T. Adali, and C. Jutten, "Multimodal data fusion: An overview of methods, challenges, and prospects," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 9, pp. 1449–1477, 2015.
- [32] S. Karaoglu, R. Tao, T. Gevers, and A. W. M. Smeulders, "Words matter: Scene text for image classification and retrieval," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 1063–1076, 2017.
- [33] Y. Su and F. Jurie, "Improving image classification using semantic attributes," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 59–77, 2012.
- [34] H. Cai, V. W. Zheng, and K. C.-C. Chang, "A comprehensive survey of graph embedding: Problems, techniques, and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 1616–1637, 2018.
- [35] L. Fan, X. Sun, and P. L. Rosin, "Siamese graph convolution network for face sketch recognition: An application using graph structure for face photo-sketch recognition," in *International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 8008–8014.
- [36] Y. Wang, Z. Yu, J. Wang, Q. Heng, H. Chen, W. Ye, R. Xie, X. Xie, and S. Zhang, "Exploring vision-language models for imbalanced learning," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 132, no. 1, pp. 224–237, 2024.
- [37] M. Yuan, N. Lv, Y. Xie, F. Lu, and K. Zhan, "Clip-fg: selecting discriminative image patches by contrastive language-image pre-training for fine-grained image classification," in *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, 2023, pp. 560–564.
- [38] J. Fu, S. Xu, H. Liu, Y. Liu, N. Xie, C.-C. Wang, J. Liu, Y. Sun, and B. Wang, "Cma-clip: Cross-modality attention clip for text-image classification," in *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, 2022, pp. 2846–2850.
- [39] D. Wang and K. Mao, "Learning semantic text features for web text-aided image classification," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 2985–2996, 2019.
- [40] G. Waltner, M. Opitz, H. Possegger, and H. Bischof, "Hibster: Hierarchical boosted deep metric learning for image retrieval," in *IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 599–608.
- [41] S. Kim, B. Jeong, and S. Kwak, "Hier: Metric learning beyond class labels via hierarchical regularization," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2023, pp. 19903–19912.
- [42] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [43] A. Krizhevsky, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," Tech. Rep., 2009.
- [44] O. Vinyals, C. Blundell, T. Lillicrap, k. kavukcuoglu, and D. Wierstra, "Matching networks for one shot learning," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [45] G. A. Miller, "Wordnet: a lexical database for english," *Communications of The ACM*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 39–41, 11 1995.
- [46] S. Zagoruyko and N. Komodakis, "Wide residual networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1605.07146, 2016.
- [47] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov, "Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1929–1958, 1 2014.
- [48] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, "Fixing weight decay regularization in adam," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.05101, 2017.
- [49] P. Foret, A. Kleiner, H. Mobahi, and B. Neyshabur, "Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [50] J. Choe, S. J. Oh, S. Chun, S. Lee, Z. Akata, and H. Shim, "Evaluation for weakly supervised object localization: Protocol, metrics, and datasets," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 1732–1748, 2023.
- [51] R. R. Selvaraju, M. Cogswell, A. Das, R. Vedantam, D. Parikh, and D. Batra, "Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 618–626.