

Classification as an IR task: Experiments and Observations

Jens Kürsten, Maximilian Eibl

sachsMEDIA 

 CHEMNITZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

 UNTERNEHMEN
REGION
The BMWF Innovation Initiative
for the New German Länder

 Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research

Chemnitz University of Technology

@

VideoCLEF 2009



TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT
CHEMNITZ

- Motivation
- System description
 - Approach
 - Resources
- Experimental results and analysis
- Conclusions and future work

- Research project sachsMedia
- Annotation and retrieval of audiovisual media
 - Video analysis (text OCR, persons, buildings, ...)
 - Audio analysis (speaker recognition, ASR, ...)
 - Metadata handling (combining metadata for retrieval)
- Digital Distribution via:
 - Broadcast (terrestrial – classical + handhelds)
 - IP and Next Generation Networks

- Classification as IR – last year's experience
- Xtrieval Framework
 - Lucene (TF.IDF) IR model
- Creating 3 index fields:
 - asr, meta and asr_meta
- Query Expansion:
 - PRF with 1 term from top-5 docs
 - English thesaurus from OO.org + Google Language API

- manually predefined Cut-off level $n = 1, 2, 3, \infty$
- automatically calculated Cut-off

$$T_{DpL} = RSV_{avg} + 2 \times \frac{RSV_{max} - RSV_{avg}}{Num_{docs}}$$

Experimental results – training data set

ID	Fields	QE	Limit	# Labels	Correct Rate	Avg. Recall	MAP
CUT1	asr	no	1	33	0,3333	0,0558	0,0485
CUT2	asr	yes	∞	1.566	0,0390	0,3096	0,1099
CUT3	asr	yes	1	181	0,1602	0,1472	0,1006
CUT4	meta	no	1	70	0,4714	0,1675	0,1546
CUT5	meta	yes	∞	1.932	0,0813	0,7970	0,4999
CUT6	meta	yes	1	188	0,3617	0,3452	0,2985
CUT7	meta	yes	2	312	0,3013	0,4772	0,3928
CUT8	meta	yes	3	368	0,3043	0,5685	0,4395
CUT9	meta	yes	auto	395	0,2886	0,5787	0,4407
CUT10	asr + meta	no	1	108	0,4537	0,2487	0,2163
CUT11	asr + meta	yes	∞	1.999	0,0795	0,8071	0,4975
CUT12	asr + meta	yes	1	205	0,3659	0,3807	0,3059
CUT13	asr + meta	yes	2	336	0,3036	0,5178	0,3993
CUT14	asr + meta	yes	3	414	0,2874	0,6041	0,4523
CUT15	asr + meta	yes	auto	470	0,2681	0,6396	0,4689

Experimental results – test data set overview

ID	Fields	QE	Limit	# Labels	Correct Rate	Avg. Recall	MAP
CUT1	asr	no	1	27	0,0741	0,0101	0,0067
CUT2	asr	yes	∞	1.996	0,0310	0,3065	0,1010
CUT3	asr	yes	1	171	0,1111	0,0958	0,0842
CUT4	meta	no	1	63	0,6349	0,2010	0,2003
CUT5	meta	yes	∞	1.778	0,0889	0,7940	0,4505
CUT6	meta	yes	1	194	0,3763	0,3668	0,2867
CUT7	meta	yes	2	300	0,3300	0,4975	0,3706
CUT8	meta	yes	3	354	0,3051	0,5427	0,4006
CUT9	meta	yes	auto	389	0,2853	0,5578	0,4073
CUT10	asr + meta	no	1	112	0,5000	0,2814	0,2586
CUT11	asr + meta	yes	∞	1.885	0,0838	0,7940	0,4389
CUT12	asr + meta	yes	1	196	0,3622	0,3568	0,2531
CUT13	asr + meta	yes	2	328	0,3018	0,4975	0,3704
CUT14	asr + meta	yes	3	393	0,2723	0,5379	0,3813
CUT15	asr + meta	yes	auto	444	0,2455	0,5478	0,3844

Result analysis – Official experiments

ID	Fields	QE	Limit	# Labels	Correct Rate	Avg. Recall	MAP
CUT1	asr	no	1	27	0,0741	0,0101	0,0067
CUT2	asr	yes	∞	1.996	0,0310	0,3065	0,1010
CUT3	asr	yes	1	171	0,1111	0,0958	0,0842
CUT4	meta	no	1	63	0,6349	0,2010	0,2003
CUT5	meta	yes	∞	1.778	0,0889	0,7940	0,4505
CUT6	meta	yes	1	194	0,3763	0,3668	0,2867
CUT7	meta	yes	2	300	0,3300	0,4975	0,3706
CUT8	meta	yes	3	354	0,3051	0,5427	0,4006
CUT9	meta	yes	auto	389	0,2853	0,5578	0,4073
CUT10	asr + meta	no	1	112	0,5000	0,2814	0,2586
CUT11	asr + meta	yes	∞	1.885	0,0838	0,7940	0,4389
CUT12	asr + meta	yes	1	196	0,3622	0,3568	0,2531
CUT13	asr + meta	yes	2	328	0,3018	0,4975	0,3704
CUT14	asr + meta	yes	3	393	0,2723	0,5379	0,3813
CUT15	asr + meta	yes	auto	444	0,2455	0,5478	0,3844

Result analysis – QE parameter

ID	Fields	QE	Limit	# Labels	Correct Rate	Avg. Recall	MAP
CUT1	asr	no	1	27	0,0741	0,0101	0,0067
CUT2	asr	yes	∞	1.996	0,0310	0,3065	0,1010
CUT3	asr	yes	1	171	0,1111	0,0958	0,0842
CUT4	meta	no	1	63	0,6349	0,2010	0,2003
CUT5	meta	yes	∞	1.778	0,0889	0,7940	0,4505
CUT6	meta	yes	1	194	0,3763	0,3668	0,2867
CUT7	meta	yes	2	300	0,3300	0,4975	0,3706
CUT8	meta	yes	3	354	0,3051	0,5427	0,4006
CUT9	meta	yes	auto	389	0,2853	0,5578	0,4073
CUT10	asr + meta	no	1	112	0,5000	0,2814	0,2586
CUT11	asr + meta	yes	∞	1.885	0,0838	0,7940	0,4389
CUT12	asr + meta	yes	1	196	0,3622	0,3568	0,2531
CUT13	asr + meta	yes	2	328	0,3018	0,4975	0,3704
CUT14	asr + meta	yes	3	393	0,2723	0,5379	0,3813
CUT15	asr + meta	yes	auto	444	0,2455	0,5478	0,3844

Result analysis – All parameters

ID	Fields	QE	Limit	# Labels	Correct Rate	Avg. Recall	MAP
CUT1	asr	no	1	27	0,0741	0,0101	0,0067
CUT2	asr	yes		1.996	0,0310	0,3065	0,1010
CUT3	asr	yes	1	171	0,1111	0,0958	0,0842
CUT4	meta	no	1	63	0,6349	0,2010	0,2003
CUT5	meta	yes		1.778	0,0889	0,7940	0,4505
CUT6	meta	yes	1	194	0,3763	0,3668	0,2867
CUT7	meta	yes	2	300	0,3300	0,4975	0,3706
CUT8	meta	yes	3	354	0,3051	0,5427	0,4006
CUT9	meta	yes	auto	389	0,2853	0,5578	0,4073
CUT10	asr + meta	no	1	112	0,5000	0,2814	0,2586
CUT11	asr + meta	yes		1.885	0,0838	0,7940	0,4389
CUT12	asr + meta	yes	1	196	0,3622	0,3568	0,2531
CUT13	asr + meta	yes	2	328	0,3018	0,4975	0,3704
CUT14	asr + meta	yes	3	393	0,2723	0,5379	0,3813
CUT15	asr + meta	yes	auto	444	0,2455	0,5478	0,3844

- Classification as IR task performs good again
- BUT: Evaluation Scenario might be two-fold
 1. Classification for user exploration (by browsing)
 2. Classification for labeling of big video databases
- 1st scenario evaluation: MAP, Recall, ...
- 2nd scenario evaluation: Correct Classification Rate,...

- Include other automatically generated metadata
- Different IR models
- Field weights for combination of ASR + metadata
- Apply further resources for QE or training (Wikipedia,...)
- Combine IR and classification approaches

- Thank you!
- Questions, answers and discussion