

# Neuro-Symbolic Models for AI

2021.12.14

Jeonbuk National University

Seung-Hoon Na

# Reference

- The symbol grounding problem [Harnad '90]
- Knowledge-based artificial neural networks [Towell & Shavlik '94]
- Harnessing Deep Neural Networks with Logic Rules [Hu et al '16]
- TensorLog: Deep Learning Meets Probabilistic DBs [Cohen et al '16]
- Neural Programmer-Interpreters [Reed & Freitas '16]
- Neural theorem prover [Rocktäschel & Riedel '16]
- Neural Symbolic Machines [Liang et al '16]
- Harnessing Deep Neural Networks with Logic Rules [Hu et al '16]
- Towards Deep Symbolic Reinforcement Learning [Garnelo et al '16]
- Learning Explanatory Rules from Noisy Data [Evans & Grefenstette '17]
- Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Denodello et al '17]
- The consciousness prior [Bengio '17]
- An Empirical Evaluation of Rule Extraction from Recurrent Neural Networks [Wang et al '18]
- Neural-Symbolic Computing: An Effective Methodology for Principled Integration of Machine Learning and Reasoning [Garcez et al '19]
- Scalable Neural Methods for Reasoning With a Symbolic Knowledge Base [Cohen et al '20]
- Neural Query Language: A Knowledge Base Query Language for Tensorflow [Cohen et al '19]
- Greedy NTPs [Minervini et al '19]

# Reference

- Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]
- R-CNN [Girshick et al '14]
- Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]
- Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]
- Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Semantic Image Interpretation (SII)
  - The task of extracting structured semantic descriptions from images
  - Requires the combined use of visual data and background knowledge
- Statistical Relational Learning (SRL)
  - Developed for reasoning under uncertainty and learning in the presence of data and rich knowledge
- Logic Tensor Networks (LTNs)
  - a SRL framework which integrates neural networks with first-order fuzzy logic to allow
    - (i) efficient learning from noisy data in the presence of logical constraints
    - (ii) reasoning with logical formulas describing general properties of the data.

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- LTNs for SII: The topic of this work
  - Develop and apply LTNs to two of the main tasks of SII
    - 1) The **classification** of an image's bounding boxes
    - 2) The detection of the relevant **part-of** relations between objects
  - Experiments show
    - Background knowledge in the form of logical constraints can improve the performance of purely data-driven approaches
      - including the state-of-the-art Fast Region-based Convolutional Neural Networks (Fast R-CNN)
    - The use of logical background knowledge adds robustness to the learning system when errors are present in the labels of the training data

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]



- Semantic Image Interpretation (SII)
  - The task of generating a structured semantic description of the content of an image
  - **Scene graph**: An example of a structured description
    - Each vertex: a bounding box of an object in the image
    - Each edge: a relation between pairs of objects
    - A **labelled** directed graph: Vertices are labelled with a set of **object types** and edges are labelled with **binary relations**
- SII: A major obstacle
  - **Semantic gap**
    - The lack of a direct correspondence between low-level features of the image and high-level semantic descriptions
    - To tackle this problem, **a system for SII must learn the latent correlations that may exist between the numerical features that can be observed in an image and the semantic concepts** associated with the objects
    - So, **the availability of relational background knowledge** can be of great help

## Image Retrieval using Scene Graphs [Jonhson et al '15]

- Top-4 retrieval results returned by different methods using two different partial scene graph queries (a, b). Differences in fully automatic scene graph grounding when applying these methods to a particular test image (c).




(a)



Ground Truth



(b)




(c)

SG-obj

SG-obj-attr-rel


# Visual Genome: Connecting Language and Vision Using Crowdsourced Dense Image Annotations [Krishna et al '16]





# Visual Genome: Connecting Language and Vision Using Crowdsourced Dense Image Annotations [Krishna et al '16]





Questions

Q. What color is the fire hydrant?  
A. Yellow.


Q. What is the woman standing next to?  
A. Her belongings.

Region Descriptions




yellow fire hydrant

man jumping over  
fire hydrantwoman in shorts is  
standing behind  
the man

Region Graphs



Scene Graph



Legend:

objects


attributes

relationships

# Visual Genome: Connecting Language and Vision Using Crowdsourced Dense Image Annotations [Krishna et al '16]

- Visual Genome Data Representation
  - Multiple regions and their descriptions
    - Mapped to WordNet
  - Multiple objects and their bounding boxes
    - Mapped to WordNet
  - A set of attributes
    - Mapped to WordNet
  - A set of relationships
    - Mapped to WordNet
  - A set of region graphs
  - One scene graph
    - combine them into a single scene graph representing the entire image


# Visual Genome [Krishna et al '16]



## Multiple regions and their descriptions


To describe all the contents of and interactions in an image, the Visual Genome dataset includes multiple human-generated image regions descriptions, with each region localized by a bounding box





### **Multiple objects and their bounding boxes**

From all of the region descriptions, we extract all objects mentioned. For example, from the region description "man jumping over a fire hydrant," we extract man and fire hydrant.



### **A set of relationships**

Our dataset also captures the relationships and interactions between objects in our images. In this example, we show the relationship jumping over between the objects man and fire hydrant.

# Image Retrieval using Scene Graphs

## [Jonhson et al '15]

Image search using a complex query like "man holding fish and wearing hat on white boat" returns unsatisfactory results

man holding fish and wearing hat on white boat



(a) Results for the query on a popular image search engine.



(b) Expected results for the query.



# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Statistical Relational Learning (SRL)
  - Statistical Artificial Intelligence (StarAI)
  - Seeks to combine data driven learning, in the presence of uncertainty, with **symbolic knowledge**
  - Only very few SRL systems have been applied to SII tasks
  - Most systems for solving SII tasks have been based, instead, on deep learning and neural network models
    - These **do not in general offer a well-founded way of learning from data in the presence of relational logical constraints**, requiring the neural models to be highly engineered from scratch

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Proposal: The SRL framework called Logic Tensor Networks (LTNs)
  - Combine learning in deep networks with relational logical constraints
  - Use a First-order Logic (FOL) syntax interpreted in the real numbers, which is implemented as a **deep tensor network**
  - Logical terms: interpreted as feature vectors in a real-valued n-dimensional space
  - Function symbols: interpreted as real-valued functions
  - Predicate symbols: interpreted as fuzzy logic relations
  - **Real semantics**: syntax and semantics
    - Allow LTNs to learn efficiently in hybrid domains where elements are composed of both numerical and relational information.
  - Argument: LTNs are a good candidate for learning SII because they can express relational knowledge in FOL which serves as constraints on the data-driven learning within tensor networks
  - Being LTN a logic, provide a **notion of logical consequence**, which forms the basis for learning within LTNs, which is defined as **best satisfiability**
  - Solving the best satisfiability problem amounts to **finding the latent correlations** that may exist between a relational back ground knowledge and numerical data attribute
    - This formulation enables the specification of **learning as reasoning**, a unique characteristic of LTNs, which is seen as highly relevant for SII.

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Logic Tensor Networks
  - $\mathcal{L}$  : a first-order logic language
    - $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ : the signature, composed of three disjoint sets
      - Denoting **constants**, **functions** and **predicate symbols**, respectively
  - $\mathcal{S}$  : any function or predicate symbol
  - $\alpha(s)$ : its arity for  $s$
  - Logical formulas in  $\mathcal{L}$  allow one to specify relational knowledge
    - $\text{partOf}(o_1, o_2)$  : the atomic formula
      - object  $o_1$  is a part of object  $o_2$
    - $\forall xy(\text{partOf}(x, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{partOf}(y, x))$ 
      - the relation  $\text{partOf}$  is asymmetric
    - $\forall x(\text{Cat}(x) \rightarrow \exists y(\text{partOf}(x, y) \wedge \text{Tail}(y)))$ 
      - every cat should have a tail
    - Exceptions are handled by allowing formulas to be interpreted in fuzzy logic, such that in the presence of an example of, say, a **tailless cat**
    - the above formula can be interpreted naturally as **normally, every cat has a tail**;

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Logic Tensor Networks
  - Semantics of  $\mathcal{L}$ 
    - The **interpretation** domain : defined as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ 
      - Every object in the domain: associated with a  $n$ -dimensional vector of real numbers.
      - This  $n$ -tuple: represents  $n$  numerical features of an object
        - » E.g.) in the case of a person, their name in ASCII, height, weight, social security number, etc
    - Functions: interpreted as realvalued functions
    - Predicates: interpreted as fuzzy relations on real vectors
    - To emphasise the fact that we interpret symbols as real numbers, use the term **grounding** instead of interpretation

## – Semantics of $\mathcal{L}$

**Definition 1** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . An  $n$ -grounding, or simply grounding,  $\mathcal{G}$  for a FOL  $\mathcal{L}$  is a function defined on the signature of  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfying the following conditions:*

1.  $\mathcal{G}(c) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for every constant symbol  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ;
2.  $\mathcal{G}(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot \alpha(f)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
3.  $\mathcal{G}(P) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot \alpha(P)} \longrightarrow [0, 1]$  for every  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

- Given a grounding  $G$ , the semantics of closed terms and atomic formulas is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{G}(f(t_1, \dots, t_m)) = \mathcal{G}(f)(\mathcal{G}(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(t_m))$$

$$\mathcal{G}(P(t_1, \dots, t_m)) = \mathcal{G}(P)(\mathcal{G}(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(t_m))$$

- The semantics for connectives is defined according to fuzzy logic; using for instance the Lukasiewicz t-norm:

$$\mathcal{G}(\neg\phi) = 1 - \mathcal{G}(\phi)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi \wedge \psi) = \max(0, \mathcal{G}(\phi) + \mathcal{G}(\psi) - 1)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi \vee \psi) = \min(1, \mathcal{G}(\phi) + \mathcal{G}(\psi))$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi \rightarrow \psi) = \min(1, 1 - \mathcal{G}(\phi) + \mathcal{G}(\psi))$$

## – Semantics of $\mathcal{L}$

- The LTN semantics for  $\forall$

- Defined in [Serafini and d’Avila Garcez, 2016] using the min operator

$$\mathcal{G}(\forall x \phi(x)) = \min_{t \in \text{term}(\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}(\phi(t))$$

 the set of instantiated terms of  $L$

- However, this is inadequate for our purposes as it does not **tolerate exceptions**
  - » The presence of a single exception to the universally-quantified formulae, such as e.g. a cat without a tail, would falsify the formulae
- Instead, our aim in SII is that the **more** examples that satisfy a formulae  $\phi(x)$ , the **higher** the truth-value of  $\forall x \phi(x)$  should be
- To capture this, we use for the semantics of  $\forall$  a **mean**-operator

$$\mathcal{G}(\forall x \phi(x)) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \text{term}(\mathcal{L})} \text{mean}_p(\mathcal{G}(\phi(t)) \mid t \in T)$$

$$\text{mean}_p(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \left( \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \text{ for } p \in \mathbb{Z}$$

## – Semantics of $\mathcal{L}$

- The classical semantics of  $\exists$  : is uniquely determined by the semantics of  $\forall$ 
  - » by making  $\exists$  equivalent to  $\neg\forall\neg$
- However, this approach has a drawback too when it comes to SII
  - » E.g.) If we adopt the arithmetic mean for the semantic of  $\forall$ 
    - then  $\mathcal{G}(\forall x\phi(x)) = \mathcal{G}(\exists x\phi(x))$
- Therefore, we shall interpret existential quantification via **Skolemization**:
  - » Every formula of the form  $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\dots \exists y \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y))$  is rewritten as  $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\dots \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, f(x_1, \dots, x_n)))$
  - » by introducing a new n-ary function symbol, called **Skolem function**
  - » In this way, **existential quantifiers can be eliminated from the language** by introducing Skolem functions

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

## – Formalizing SII in LTNs

- $\Sigma_{\text{SII}} = \langle \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P} \rangle$  : a signature

- $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{p \in \text{Pics}} b(p)$  : the set of identifiers for all the bounding boxes in all the images

- $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$

- $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$

- »  $\mathcal{P}_1$  : a set of unary predicates, one for each object type

- E.g.)  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{\text{Dog, Cat, Tail, Muzzle, Train, Coach, } \dots\}$

- »  $\mathcal{P}_2$  : a set of binary predicates representing relations between objects

- E.g.) in our case,  $\mathcal{P}_2 = \{\text{partOf}\}$



# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

## – Formalizing SII in LTNs

- A grounding for  $\Sigma_{\text{SII}}$

- Each constant  $b$ , denoting a bounding box can be associated with a set of **geometric features** and a set of **semantic features** computed with a bounding box detector

- » That is, each bounding box is associated with **geometric features** describing the position and the dimension of the bounding box, and **semantic features** describing the classification score returned by the bounding box detector for each class

- $\mathcal{G}(b)$ : the  $\mathbb{R}^{4+|\mathcal{P}_1|}$  vector for each bounding  $b \in \mathcal{C}$

$\langle class(C_1, b), \dots, class(C_{|\mathcal{P}_1|}, b), \underbrace{x_0(b), y_0(b), x_1(b), y_1(b))}_{\text{The coordinates of the top-left and bottom-right corners of } b} \rangle$

$C_i \in \mathcal{P}_1$

The coordinates of the top-left and bottom-right corners of  $b$

- $class(C_i, b) \in [0, 1]$  : the classification score of the bounding box detector for  $b$

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

## – Formalizing SII in LTNs

- An example of groundings for predicates: can be defined by taking a **one-vs-all multi-classifier** approach

- 1) Define the following grounding for each class  $C_i \in \mathcal{P}_1$

»  $\mathbf{x} = \langle x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{P}_1|+4} \rangle$  : the vector corresponding to the grounding of a bounding box

$$\mathcal{G}(C_i)(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq l \leq |\mathcal{P}_1|} x_l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- 2) a simple **rule-based approach** for defining a grounding for the partOf relation is based on the naive assumption that

» The more a bounding box  $b$  is contained within a bounding box  $b'$ , the higher the probability should be that  $b$  is part of  $b'$

»  $\mathcal{G}(\text{partOf}(b, b')) : ir(b, b')$  of bounding box  $b$ , with grounding  $\mathbf{x}$ , into bounding box  $b'$ , with grounding  $\mathbf{x}'$

$$ir(b, b') = \frac{\text{area}(b \cap b')}{\text{area}(b)}$$

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

## – Formalizing SII in LTNs

- 2)' A slightly more sophisticated **rule-based grounding** for part of:
  - Takes into account also **type compatibilities** by multiplying the inclusion ratio by a factor  $w$

$$\mathcal{G}(\text{partOf}(b, b')) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } ir(b, b') \cdot \max_{i,j=1}^{|\mathcal{P}_1|} (w_{ij} \cdot x_i \cdot x'_j) \geq th_{ir} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

»  $w_{ij} = 1$  if  $C_i$  is a part of  $C_j$ , and 0 otherwise

- Given the above grounding, we can compute the grounding of any atomic formula
  - E.g.)  $\text{Cat}(b_1), \text{Dog}(b_2), \text{leg}(b_3)$  **expressing the degree of truth of the formula.**

$\text{partOf}(b_3, b_1), \text{partOf}(b_3, b_2)$

» The rule-based groundings may not satisfy all the constraints to be imposed

- The classification score may be wrong, a bounding box may include another one which is not in the part-of relation, etc
- **Instead, groundings should be learned automatically from data, by optimizing the truth-values of the formulas in the background knowledge**

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Learning as Best Satisfiability
  - $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  : a **partial grounding**
    - A grounding that is defined on a subset of the signature of  $L$
  - $\mathcal{G}$  : is said to be a **completion** of  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  , if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a **grounding for  $L$**  and coincides with  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  on the symbols where  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  is defined

**Definition 2** A grounded theory GT is a pair  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$  with a set  $\mathcal{K}$  of closed formulas and a partial grounding  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ .

**Definition 3** A grounding  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies a GT  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$  if  $\mathcal{G}$  completes  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\mathcal{G}(\phi) = 1$  for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{K}$ . A GT  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$  is satisfiable if there exists a grounding  $\mathcal{G}$  that satisfies  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$ .

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Learning as Best Satisfiability
  - Deciding the satisfiability of  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$ 
    - Amounts to searching for a grounding  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  such that all the formulas of  $\mathcal{K}$  are mapped to 1
    - Differently from the classical satisfiability, when a GT is not satisfiable, we are **interested in the best possible satisfaction** that we can reach with a grounding



**Definition 4** *Let  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$  be a grounded theory. We define the best satisfiability problem as the problem of finding a grounding  $\mathcal{G}^*$  that maximizes the truth-values of the conjunction of all clauses  $cl \in \mathcal{K}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{G}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\hat{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathcal{G}(\bigwedge_{cl \in \mathcal{K}} cl)$ .*

# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Learning as Best Satisfiability
  - Grounding  $G^*$  captures the latent correlation between quantitative attributes of objects and their categorical/relational properties.
  - Not all functions are suitable as a grounding; they should preserve some form of **regularity**
  - If  $\mathcal{G}(\text{Cat})(\mathbf{x}) \approx 1$  The bounding box with feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$  contains a cat
  - then for every  $\mathbf{x}'$  close to  $\mathbf{x}$  (i.e. for every bounding box with features similar to  $\mathbf{x}$ )  $\mathcal{G}(\text{Cat})(\mathbf{x}') \approx 1$

- Learning as Best Satisfiability

- The form of groundings

- Function symbols are grounded to **linear transformations**
- $\mathcal{G}(f)$  if  $f$  is a  $m$ -ary function symbol:

$$\mathcal{G}(f)(\mathbf{v}) = M_f \mathbf{v} + N_f$$

- where  $\mathbf{v} = \langle \mathbf{v}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m^\top \rangle^\top$  is the  $mn$ -ary vector obtained by concatenating each  $\mathbf{v}_i$
- The parameters for  $\mathcal{G}(f)$ : the  $n \times mn$  real matrix  $M_f$  and the  $n$ -vector  $N_f$

- $\mathcal{G}(P)$ , the grounding of an  $m$ -ary predicate  $P$ :

- Defined as a generalization of the **neural tensor network**

- $\mathcal{G}(P)(\mathbf{v}) = \sigma \left( u_P^\top \tanh \left( \mathbf{v}^\top W_P^{[1:k]} \mathbf{v} + V_P \mathbf{v} + b_P \right) \right)$

- $W_P^{[1:k]} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times mn \times mn}$

$$V_P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times mn}, b_P \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad u_P \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

- Learning as Best Satisfiability
  - Build a suitable GT for SII
    - $Pics^t \subseteq Pics$  : a set of bounding boxes of images correctly labelled with the classes that they belong to
    - Let each pair of bounding boxes be correctly labelled with the **part-of relation**
    - In machine learning terminology,  $Pics^t$  is a **training set** without noise
    - In real semantics, a training set can be represented by a theory:
 
$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{expl}} = \langle \mathcal{K}_{\text{expl}}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$$
      - $\mathcal{K}_{\text{expl}}$ : contains the set of closed literals  $C_i(b)$  and  $partOf(b, b')$
      - The partial grounding  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ : defined on all bounding boxes of all the images in  $Pics$  where both **the semantic features  $class(C_i, b)$  and the bounding box coordinates** are computed by the Fast R-CNN object detector
        - » But **not defined for the predicate symbols in  $\mathcal{P}$  and is to be learned**



## – Build a suitable GT for SII

- $\mathcal{T}_{\text{expl}}$  contains only assertional information about specific bounding boxes.
  - This is the classical setting of machine learning where classifiers (i.e. the grounding of predicates) are inductively learned from positive examples (such as  $\text{partOf}(b, b')$ ) and negative examples ( $\neg \text{partOf}(b, b')$ ) of a classification
- In this learning setting, mereological constraints such as “*cats have no wheels*” or “*a tail is a part of a cat*” are not taken into account.
- E.g.) Examples of mereological constraints state
  - 1) the part-of relation is asymmetric
$$\forall xy(\text{partOf}(x, y) \rightarrow \neg \text{partOf}(y, x))$$
  - 2) lists the several parts of an object
$$\forall xy(\text{Cat}(x) \wedge \text{partOf}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{Tail}(y) \vee \text{Muzzle}(y))$$
  - 3) every whole object cannot be part of another object
$$\forall xy(\text{Cat}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{partOf}(x, y))$$
  - 4) every part object cannot be divided further into parts
$$\forall xy(\text{Tail}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{partOf}(y, x))$$

## – Build a suitable GT for SII

- This general knowledge is available from on-line resources, such as WORDNET [Fellbaum, 1998], and can be retrieved by inheriting the meronymy relations for every concept corresponding to a whole object
- A grounded theory that considers also mereological constraints as prior knowledge can be constructed by adding such axioms to  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{expl}}$
- More formally, we define,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{prior}} = \langle \mathcal{K}_{\text{prior}}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{prior}} = \mathcal{K}_{\text{expl}} + \mathcal{M}$$

- $\mathcal{M}$  : the set of mereological axioms


# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Experimental evaluation
  - Object Type Classification and Detection of the PartOf Relation
    - Train two LTNs
      - 1) The first containing only training examples of object types and part-of relations ( $T_{expl}$ )
      - 2) The second containing also logical axioms about types and part-of ( $T_{prior}$ )
    - The LTNs were set up with tensor of  $k = 6$  layers
    - We chose Lukasiewicz's T-norm ( $\mu(a, b) = \max(0, a + b - 1)$ ) and use the harmonic mean as aggregation operator.


# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Experimental evaluation
  - Object Type Classification and Detection of the PartOf Relation

Precision-recall curves for indoor objects type classification and the partOf relation between objects.



(a) LTNs with prior knowledge improve the performance of Fast R-CNN on object type classification, achieving an Area Under the Curve (AUC) of 0.800 in comparison with 0.756.



(b) LTNs with prior knowledge outperform the rule-based approach of Eq.2 in the detection of part-of relations, achieving AUC of 0.598 in comparison with 0.172.


# Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Donadello et al '17]

- Experimental evaluation

- Robustness to Noisy Training Data


- AUCs for indoor object types and part-of relation with increasing noise in the labels of the training data. The drop in performance is noticeably smaller for the LTN trained with background knowledge.

AUC evolution for types



(a) Object types


AUC evolution for part-of



(b) Part-of predicate

# R-CNN [Girshick et al '14]

## R-CNN: *Regions with CNN features*



**Figure 1: Object detection system overview.** Our system (1) takes an input image, (2) extracts around 2000 bottom-up region proposals, (3) computes features for each proposal using a large convolutional neural network (CNN), and then (4) classifies each region using class-specific linear SVMs. R-CNN achieves a mean average precision (mAP) of **53.7% on PASCAL VOC 2010**. For comparison, [39] reports 35.1% mAP using the same region proposals, but with a spatial pyramid and bag-of-visual-words approach. The popular deformable part models perform at 33.4%. On the 200-class **ILSVRC2013 detection dataset**, **R-CNN's mAP is 31.4%**, a large improvement over OverFeat [34], which had the previous best result at 24.3%.

# Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]

- Motivation

- R-CNN has notable drawbacks:

- **1. Training is a multi-stage pipeline.**

- R-CNN first finetunes a ConvNet on object proposals using log loss. Then, it fits SVMs to ConvNet features. These SVMs act as object detectors, replacing the softmax classifier learnt by fine-tuning. In the third training stage, bounding-box regressors are learned.

- **2. Training is expensive in space and time.**

- For SVM and bounding-box regressor training, features are extracted from each object proposal in each image and written to disk. With very deep networks, such as VGG16, this process takes 2.5 GPU-days for the 5k images of the VOC07 trainval set. These features require hundreds of gigabytes of storage.

- **3. Object detection is slow.**

- At test-time, features are extracted from each object proposal in each test image. Detection with VGG16 takes 47s / image (on a GPU).

# Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]

- Motivation
  - SPPnet
    - R-CNN is slow because it performs a ConvNet forward pass for each object proposal, without sharing computation. Spatial pyramid pooling networks (SPPnets) were proposed to speed up R-CNN by sharing computation.
    - The SPPnet method computes a convolutional feature map for the entire input image and then classifies each object proposal using a feature vector extracted from the shared feature map.
      - Features are extracted for a proposal by maxpooling the portion of the feature map inside the proposal into a fixed-size output (e.g.,  $6 \times 6$ ).
      - Multiple output sizes are pooled and then concatenated as in spatial pyramid pooling.
      - SPPnet accelerates R-CNN by 10 to  $100\times$  at test time. Training time is also reduced by  $3\times$  due to faster proposal feature extraction.



# Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]

- Motivation
  - SPPnet also has notable drawbacks:
    - Like R-CNN, training is a multi-stage pipeline that involves extracting features, fine-tuning a network with log loss, training SVMs, and finally fitting bounding-box regressors.
    - Features are also written to disk. But unlike R-CNN, the fine-tuning algorithm cannot update the convolutional layers that precede the spatial pyramid pooling.
      - Unsurprisingly, this limitation (fixed convolutional layers) limits the accuracy of very deep networks.

# Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]

- Contributions: Fast R-CNN
  - 1. Higher detection quality (mAP) than R-CNN, SPPnet
  - 2. Training is single-stage, using a multi-task loss
  - 3. Training can update all network layers
  - 4. No disk storage is required for feature caching

# Fast R-CNN [Girshick et al '15]





Figure 1. Fast R-CNN architecture. An input image and multiple regions of interest (RoIs) are input into a fully convolutional network. Each RoI is pooled into a fixed-size feature map and then mapped to a feature vector by fully connected layers (FCs). The network has two output vectors per RoI: softmax probabilities and per-class bounding-box regression offsets. The architecture is trained end-to-end with a multi-task loss.

# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]


- Different schemes for addressing multiple scales and sizes



(a) Pyramids of images and feature maps are built, and the classifier is run at all scales

# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]


- Different schemes for addressing multiple scales and sizes



(b) Pyramids of filters with multiple scales/sizes are run on the feature map

# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]


- Different schemes for addressing multiple scales and sizes



(c) We use pyramids of reference boxes in the regression functions.


# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]

- Faster R-CNN is a single, unified network for object detection. The RPN module serves as the 'attention' of this unified network



# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]




- Region Proposal Network (RPN)





# Faster R-CNN [Ren et al '16]

- Example detections using RPN proposals on PASCAL VOC 2007 test. Our method detects objects in a wide range of scales and aspect ratios



# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]


- LTNs for SII
  - Rely on convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to extract **semantic features** which form the basis for grounding object instances in a real vector
  - Previous works relied on pre-trained CNNs
    - However suffer from all the limitations traditionally associated with deep learning, namely, the need for a large-scale annotated dataset for training, and lack of interpretability.
    - To fully reap the benefits of NeSy techniques in SII, end-to-end architectures in which **the LTN is jointly trained with the feature extraction CNN** are needed.

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Proposal: Faster-LTN
  - An object detector which unifies the Faster R-CNN object detector with a LTN-based classification head
  - Differently from previous works, both modules are jointly trained in an end-to-end fashion
  - The logical constraints imposed by the LTN can thus shape the training of the convolutional layers, that are no longer purely data-driven
  - To achieve this objective, we propose several modifications to the original LTN formulation to increase the architecture scalability and deal with data imbalance

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Faster-LTN architecture



The first part of the architecture, up to the RPN, is the same as in the Faster R-CNN network [15]. The feature maps associated to the RPN proposals are extracted by the backbone, concatenated and passed to the LTN, which includes a collection of predicates  $P_i$ , each corresponding to a specific class. At training time, a batch of labelled examples in the training dataset are used to define a partial theory  $T_{expl}$ . Each positive or negative example corresponds to a positive or negative literal (L) for the corresponding predicates. The truth value of the aggregated clauses (C) is maximized to find the optimal grounding  $G^*$ . At inference time, the truth value of the predicates  $P_i$  is computed.

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Faster-LTN architecture
  - Faster R-CNN
    - A two-stage object detector composed of a Region Proposal Network (RPN) and a classification network with a shared backbone
    - For each anchor, the RPN generates a binary classification label (Background vs. foreground), while a regression layer computes the bounding box coordinates.
    - Regions of Interest (ROIs) selected by the RPN are fed to an ROI Pooling layer, which extracts and resizes each proposal bounding box's features from the shared backbone.
    - Feature maps of equal size are passed to the classifier
    - The classifier comprises two convolutional heads, a classification layer that computes the final object classification and a regression layer (with linear activation) that computes the bounding box
    - Training of the RPN and classifier heads is performed jointly in an alternating fashion:

$$L(\{p_i\}, \{b_i\}) = \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_i L_{cls}(p_i, p'_i) + \lambda \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_i p_i * L_{reg}(b_i, b'_i)$$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Logic Tensor Network

- Grounding

- In the LTN framework, it is possible to encode a FOL language  $L$  by defining its interpretation domain as a subset of  $R^n$ . In the LTN formalism, this process is called **grounding**
    - Given the vector space  $R^n$ , a grounding  $G$  for  $L$  has the following properties

1.  $\mathcal{G}(c) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , for every  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ;
2.  $\mathcal{G}(P) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , for every  $p \in \mathcal{P}$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Logic Tensor Network

- Grounding

- The grounding of a set of **closed terms**  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  of  $L$  in an atomic formula is defined as:

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(t_1, \dots, t_m)) = \mathcal{G}(P)(\mathcal{G}(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(t_m))$$

- Formulas can be connected with fuzzy logic operators such as conjunctions ( $\wedge$ ), disjunctions ( $\vee$ ), and implications ( $\Rightarrow$ ), including logical quantifiers ( $\forall$  and  $\exists$ ).
    - Several real-valued, differentiable implementations are available in the fuzzy logic domain
    - Our implementation, as in [3], is based on the Lukasiewicz [16] formulation:

$$\mathcal{G}(\neg\phi) = 1 - \mathcal{G}(\phi)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi \vee \psi) = \min(1, \mathcal{G}(\phi) + \mathcal{G}(\psi))$$



# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Logic Tensor Network

- Grounding

- Predicate symbols are interpreted as functions that map real vectors to the interval  $[0, 1]$ , which can be interpreted as the predicate's degree of truth.
    - A typical example is the **is-a** predicate, which quantifies the existence of a given object.
      - if  $b = \mathcal{G}(x)$  is the grounding of a dog bounding box,  
than  $\mathcal{G}(\text{Dog})(\mathbf{v}) \simeq 1$
      - A logical constraint expressed in FOL allows to define its properties, i.e.
$$\forall x (\text{Dog}(x) \rightarrow \text{hasMuzzle}(x))$$
    - In LTNs, predicates are typically defined as the generalization of the neural tensor network

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P})(\mathbf{v}) = \sigma \left( u_P^T \tanh \left( \mathbf{v}_T W_P^{[1:k]} \mathbf{v} + V_P \mathbf{v} + b_p \right) \right)$$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Logic Tensor Network
  - Grounded theory:  $\mathcal{T}$ 
    - Defined by a pair  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$ 
      - The knowledge base  $\mathcal{K}$  : a set of closed formulas,
      - $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  : a partial grounding
      - $\mathcal{K}$  : constructed from labelled examples, as well as logical axioms
    - In practice, a partial grounding is optimized since, qualitatively, our set  $\mathcal{K}$  represents a limited and finite set of examples
    - A grounding  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies a GT  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \hat{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$ 
      - If  $\mathcal{G}$  completes  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\mathcal{G}(\phi) = 1 \ \forall \ \phi \in \mathcal{K}$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Logic Tensor Network
  - Best satisfiability problem
    - Given a grounding  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\theta}$ 
      - The learning problem in LTNs is framed as a best satisfiability problem which consists in determining the values of  $\Theta^*$  that maximize the truth values of the conjunction of all clauses  $\phi \in \mathcal{K}$

$$\Theta^* = \underset{\Theta}{\operatorname{argmax}}_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\theta}} \left( \bigwedge_{\phi \in \mathcal{K}} \phi \right) - \lambda ||\Theta||_2^2$$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- LTN for object detection
  - A grounded theory for object detection
    - Let us consider a set of bounding boxes  $b \in B$  with known class  $c \in C$
    - An object with bounding box  $b_n$  is grounded by the vector
$$\mathbf{v}_{b_n} = \langle \mathbf{z}_{b_n}, b_n \rangle$$
  - $\mathbf{z}_{b_n} = f(I, b_n)$  : an embedding feature vector, calculated by a convolutional neural network  $f$ , given an image  $I$  and the bounding box coordinates  $b_n$  predicted by the RPN layer
  - This setup is slightly different from previous works,
    - » where the grounding of a bounding box was defined by the probability vector predicted by a pre-trained Faster R-CNN, and allows to effectively connect the convolutional layers and the LTN

- LTN for object detection
  - A grounded theory for object detection
    - $f(I, b_n)$  : set as the output of the last fully connected layer of the classifier head, without softmax activation
    - The *is-a* predicate for class  $c \in C$  is grounded by a tensor network
    - The *is-a* predicate takes as input only the embedding features  $\mathbf{z}_{b_n}$ , excluding the bounding box coordinate
    - The part-of predicate is defined over pairs of bounding boxes
 
$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{b}_{m,l}} = \langle \mathbf{z}_{b_m}, b_m, \mathbf{z}_{b_l}, b_l, ir_{m,l} \rangle$$
    - $ir_{m,l}$  is the containment ratio defined as:

$$ir_{m,l} = \frac{Area(b_m \cap b_l)}{Area(b_m)}$$

- $\mathcal{G}(\text{part} - \text{of})(\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{b}_{m,l}})$ : a neural tensor network

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- LTN for object detection
  - Two grounded theories  $T_{expl}$  and  $T_{prior}$  are defined
  - $\mathcal{T}_{expl}$  : aggregates all the clauses derived from the labelled training set
  - $\mathcal{T}_{prior}$  : introduces logical and mereological constraints that represent prior knowledge or, in a more general sense, desirable properties of the final solution.
  - Two types of constraints are defined
    - 1) mutual exclusion
$$\forall x (P_1(x) \implies (\neg P_2(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P_n(x)))$$
    - 2) mereological constraints
$$\forall x, y (\text{Cat}(x) \wedge \text{partOf}(y, x) \rightarrow \text{Tail}(y) \vee \text{Head}(y) \dots \vee \text{Eye}(y))$$

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Faster-LTN
  - In the original implementation (LTN for SII), the LTN was trained on the predictions of a pre-trained object detector, allowing for a relatively large batch size
  - In our setting, the LTN is **trained on all proposals extracted by the RPN**, and **a separate batch is constructed for each image**, taking into account background as well as foreground examples
    - One-vs-all classification amplifies the data imbalance between positive and negative examples for each class, even when the training batch consists of an equal number of objects and background propo

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Faster-LTN
  - Aggregation function: the log-product,
    - However, in our case, this choice does not weight adequately the contribution of positive examples, given the high level of class imbalance
      - Inspired by [Lin et al '17], we introduce the **focal** log-product aggregation defined as

$$L_{LTN} = - \sum_{j=0}^K \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_c (1 - x_{i,j})^\gamma \log(x_{i,j})$$



# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Results of the Faster R-CNN (FR-CNN), Faster R-CNN with focal loss (FR-CNN FL), and Faster-LTN (F-LTN) on PASCAL VOC

Class	FR-CNN	FR-CNN FL	F-LTN	F-LTN $\alpha$	F-LTN bg	F-LTN bg + $\alpha$
aeroplane	66.5	56.9	87.1	85.1	87.8	85.2
bicycle	69.9	64.1	75.6	77.3	77.8	77.4
bird	70.8	68.4	84.9	87.8	87.2	87.1
boat	41.3	35.8	59.7	70.3	62.2	67.1
bottle	51.0	44.1	48.2	45.8	43.7	47.0
bus	75.8	71.3	79.1	79.0	79.8	78.6
car	59.0	53.1	60.0	58.7	62.9	60.1
cat	92.4	90.0	93.5	92.4	94.1	94.8
chair	32.1	32.7	53.4	42.8	53.4	42.9
cow	64.6	60.7	67.1	66.3	60.1	72.6
diningtable	57.2	51.1	74.2	77.0	71.3	77.1
dog	85.3	83.3	93.6	92.3	92.5	92.0
horse	61.1	62.3	82.2	80.4	85.4	85.0
motorbike	62.0	65.3	86.7	81.0	85.6	85.0
person	70.7	68.7	72.6	49.5	74.1	53.3
pottedplant	29.0	25.4	53.1	49.2	48.8	51.8
sheep	62.2	62.1	71.2	71.4	74.7	69.1
sofa	59.9	51.9	79.2	82.0	86.4	80.1
train	73.3	73.2	75.4	77.2	79.6	81.6
tvmonitor	68.7	63.3	78.5	76.6	77.1	76.6
<b>mAP</b>	<b>62.6</b>	<b>59.2</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>73.25</b>

# Faster-LTN: a neuro-symbolic, end-to-end object detection architecture [Manigrasso et al '21]

- Experiment results

- Comparison of Faster R-CNN and Faster-LTN (including mereological constraints) on the PASCAL PART dataset

Dataset	Metric	FR-CNN	F-LTN $\mathcal{T}_{prior}$
PASCAL PART	mAP	35.1	41.2
PASCAL PART REDUCED	mAP	28.5	32.8

- Comparison of the t-SNE embeddings of the features extracted for the whole objects classes in the test set

