Transformers for Vision

- The de facto neural architecture of many applications
 - GPT: generative pre-training Transformer
 - Gemini: multi-modal LLMs
 - Computer vision
 - Speech recognition



ChatGPT



Gemini



Claude

Llama

Attention

- Attention compute a weighted average of hidden state vectors.
- Formally:
 - Given N k-dimensional input vector $x^1 \dots x^N$ and output vector $y^1 \dots y^N$
 - Output y^i is a weighted average of input vector; w_{ij} is the attention weight from position i over x^j
 - $y^i = \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{w}_{ij} x^j$

Formulation of Self-attention

- Given N k-dimensional input vector $x^1 \dots x^N$ and output vector $y^1 \dots y^N$
- Conventional projection layer:
 - Output y^i is a weighted average of input vector

•
$$y^i = \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{w}_{ij} x^j$$

- Self-attention: self-dependent
 - The weight w_{ij} depends on input **itself** x^{j}

•
$$w'_{ij} = \sum_k x^i_k x^j_k$$

• Followed by Softmax normalization:
$$w_{ij} = \frac{\exp(w'_{ij})}{\sum_{j} \exp(w'_{ij})}$$

Self-attention with Query, Key, Value

- Self-attention: The weight w_{ij} depends on input itself
 - $w'_{ij} = \sum_k x^i_k x^j_k$
 - the input x^i is to matched the input x^j
- More flexible version: add learnable parameters
 - Linear projection layer with learnable weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$
 - Query: $Q^i = W_q x^i$, to match others
 - Key: $K^i = W_k x^i$, to be matched
 - Value: $V^i = W_v x^i$

Self-attention with Query, Key, Value

- Q, K, V are linearly projected
 - Query: $Q^i = W_q x^i$
 - Key: $K^i = W_k x^i$
 - Value: $V^i = W_v x^i$
- Compute attention weight based on Q^i and K

•
$$A_{ij} = \frac{\exp(Q^{i}K^{i})}{\sum_{j} \exp(Q^{i}K^{j})}$$

Self-attention with Query, Key, Value

• Compute attention weight based on Q^i and K

•
$$A_{ij} = \frac{\exp(Q^{i}K^{i})}{\sum_{j} \exp(Q^{i}K^{j})}$$

- Aggregated with value vector V
 - The new output for i-th position depends on the attention weights and value vectors of all input positions j

•
$$y^i = \sum_{j=1}^T A_j^i V^j$$

Scaled Dot-product Attention

- Scale factor \sqrt{d} normalizes the dot product values QK^T , preventing their variance from becoming overly large.
- Scale dot-product: $A = Softmax(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d}})$
- Matrix Multiplication: y = AV



scaled dot – product: $A_{1,i} = \frac{QK^{T}}{\sqrt{d}}$ Q: query (to match others) K: key (to be matched) V: value

x: input vector before projection

9







Quadratic complexity

- Attention(Q, K, V) = $Softmax\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d}}\right)V$
- Complexity: $O(n^2 \cdot d)$
- *n* = sequence length, *d* = hidden dimension

Cross-attention

- Given two different input vector *x* and *m*
- Input to Cross-attention
 - Query: $Q^i = W_q x^i$
 - Key: $K^i = W_k m^i$
 - Value: $V^i = W_v m^i$
- Source vector x is attended to target vector m
- Compute cross-attention weight based on Qⁱ and K

•
$$A_{ij} = \frac{\exp(Q^i K^i)}{\sum_j \exp(Q^i K^j)}$$

Rethink Cross-attention as Feature Clustering

- (not exactly the same)
- input vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ $(Q^i = W_q x^i)$ is the <u>feature centroids</u> with N centroids
- input vector $m \in \mathbb{R}^{HW \times d}$ ($K^j = W_k m^j$, $V^i = W_v m^i$) is the pixel features
- Cross-attention weight *v.s.* Soft assignment based on feature distance • $A_{ij} = \frac{\exp(Q^i K^j)}{\sum_l \exp(Q^i K^l)}$
- Value aggregation *v.s.* <u>Centroid update</u>:

•
$$O^i = \sum_{j=1}^M A^i_j V^j$$

Positional encoding

- Motivation:
 - While the attention mechanism is powerful, it doesn't inherently capture the **order of elements** within the sequence.
 - In language, the order of words is crucial for meaning. For example, "The cat sat on the mat" has a different meaning than "The mat sat on the cat."
 - Similarly, in computer vision, the permutation of image pixels matters.

Positional encoding

• append t to the input

$$\bar{x}_t = \left[\begin{array}{c} x_t \\ t \end{array} \right]$$

- This is not a great idea, because absolute position is less important than relative position
- we want to represent position in a way that tokens with similar relative position have similar positional encoding

• More advanced positional encoding (e.g., frequency-based, learningbased, relative positional encoding) are not discussed in this lecture.



Multi-head self-attention

- Run h attention models in parallel on top of different linearly projected versions of Q, K, V; concatenate and linearly project the results
- Intuition: enables model to attend to different kinds of information at different positions



Transformer block

- A Transformer is a sequence of transformer blocks
 - Vaswani et al.:
 - 12 blocks, 512 embedding dimension, 6 attention heads
 - Multi-Head Attention: introduced before
 - Add & Norm: residual connection followed by layer normalization
 - Feedforward (Multi-layer perceptron): two linear layers with ReLUs in between, applied independently to each vector
- Attention is the only interaction between inputs







Transformer Encoder:

- □ Self-attention
- Serves as strong feature extracting/enhancing modules.



Transformer Encoder: Vision Transformer (ViT)





[1] Attention Is All You Need. NeurIPS 2017.

[2] ViT: Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale. ICLR 2021.





Transformer Decoder:

- □ Cross-attention
- Serves as a bridge for sequence-to-sequence translation

Extracting pixel-level representation

Transformer Encoder:

- □ Self-attention
- Serves as strong feature extracting/enhancing modules.



Converting to object-level representation

Transformer Decoder:

- Cross-attention
- Serves as a bridge for sequence-to-sequence translation

Vision Transformers (ViTs)

ViT: the pioneer of Transformer architectures for vision



[1] Dosovitskiy, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. ICLR 2021

Vision Transformers (ViTs)



ViT: overview

- Divide an input image into 196 (14x14) small images of size (16x16)
- Treat it as embedding in NLP
- Use it as an input for traditional transformer encoder (like in BERT)
- Use 12 transformer layers (Norm, Multi-head attention, etc.)
- the last output, use it as input for Dense Layer with 1000
- you have a classification model

[1] Dosovitskiy, et al. ViT: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. ICLR 2021

ViT: performance comparison to CNN

JFT-300M is an internal Google dataset with 300M labeled images

If you pretrain on JFT and finetune on ImageNet, large ViTs outperform large ResNets



ViT: strength and weakness

- Strength:
 - Long-range interaction via global attention
 - Strong performance/scalability with large scale of data
- Weakness:
 - Quadratic computational complexity
 - Lacking locality
 - Lacking low-level details due to large patch size (e.g., 16x16)

Key difference between Visual and Text Signals

<mark>multi-scale</mark> (scale invariance)



locality (spatial smoothness)



translation invariance



I am a **fat cat**. I am a **fat fat cat cat. (invalid)**

No scale variation

No spatial smoothness

I like the green grass.

Example adapted from Ross Girshick and Ze Liu

l am a fat cat. Fat cat is me. Sensitive to absolute locations

Hierarchical Vision Transformer

- Swin Transformer: Hierarchical Vision Transformer using Shifted Windows
 - Multi-scale (hierarchical) feature map
 - Use shifted window to get image patches



Patch/Feature bin



More friendly to visual signals multi-scale / locality / translation invariance

Hybrid CNN-Transformer Model

- Formulation:
 - Micro-level Hybrid Model
 - Each basic block is designed with convolutional layer and self-attention layers
 - The model stack with several basic blocks repeatedly
 - Macro-level Hybrid Model
 - Each basic block is either pure CNN block or pure Transformer block
 - The model starts with few CNN blocks
 - The model further stacks several Transformer blocks
- Strength
 - Preserve local information due to CNN
 - Preserve translation invariance due to CNN
 - Efficient learning of spatial hierarchy due to CNN
 - Enable global interaction due to Transformer

Examples

- Hybrid Transformer for visual recognition: Yang et al., MOAT, ICLR 2023
- Hybrid Transformer for medical AI: Chen et al., TransUNet, arXiv 2021
- Hybrid Transformer for vision-language: Chen et al., ViTamin, CVPR 2024

[1] Yang, et al. Moat: Alternating mobile convolution and attention brings strong vision models ICLR 2023
 [2] Chen, et al. Transunet: Transformers make strong encoders for medical image segmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04306, 2021.

[3] Chen, et al. Design scalable vision models in the vision-language era, CVPR 2024

Hybrid Transformer for Visual Recognition



• Yang et al. MOAT ICLR2023

Figure 1: **Block comparison.** (a) The MBConv block (Sandler et al., 2018) employs the inverted bottleneck design with depthwise convolution and squeeze-and-excitation (Hu et al., 2018) applied to the expanded features. (b) The Transformer block (Vaswani et al., 2017) consists of a self-attention module and a MLP module. (c) The proposed MOAT block effectively combines them. The illustration assumes the input tensor has channels *c*.

[1] Yang, et al. Moat: Alternating mobile convolution and attention brings strong vision models ICLR 2023
Hybrid Transformer + UNet: TransUNet



[2] Chen, et al. Transunet: Transformers make strong encoders for medical image segmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04306, 2021.

Hybrid Transformer for Vision-Language

• Chen et al.

CVPR 2024



Figure 3. **Overview of ViTamin architecture**. (a) ViTamin begins with a convolutional stem, followed by Mobile Convolution Blocks (MBConv) in stage 1 and 2, and Transformer Blocks (TFB) in stage 3. The 2D input to the stage 3 is flatten to 1D. For the *macro-level* designs, the three-stage layout generates the final feature map with output stride 16, similar to ViT/16 [31]. We set channels sizes for the three stages to be (C, 2C, 6C). For the *micro-level* designs, the employed MBConv-LN modifies MBConv [115] by using a single LayerNorm [4]. TFB-GeGLU upgrades TFB's FFNs [131] (Feed-Forward Networks) with GELU Gated Linear Units [117]. (b) In the CLIP framework, given N image-text pairs, the vision model's output I_i is learned to align with its corresponding text Transformer's output T_i . Our text Transformers are the same as OpenCLIP [62]. +: Addition. *: Multiplication.

[1] Chen, et al. Design scalable vision models in the vision-language era, CVPR 2024

Summary

- Transformers consist of several Transformer blocks with multihead self-attention layer and feedforward layers.
- It is highly scalable and highly parallelizable
- Faster training, larger models, better performance across vision and language tasks
- Good capability in vision tasks.

Dual-Path Transformer: MaX-DeepLab

- Dual Path: Pixel Path + Memory Path
 - Memory to store global information
- Self-attention:
 - P2P: Pixel-to-pixel self-attention
 - Both query and key are pixel vector itself
 - M2M: Memory-to-memory self-attention
 - Both query and key are memory itself
- Cross-attention
 - P2M: Pixel-to-memory cross-attention
 - Query is pixel, key is memory
 - M2P: Memory-to-pixel cross-attention
 - Query is memory, key is pixel



Wang, et al. MaX-DeepLab: End-to-End Panoptic Segmentation With Mask Transformers. CVPR 2021.

Dual-Path Transformer: MaX-DeepLab

- Dual Path: Pixel Path + Memory Path
- Prediction: *N* pairs of object class $p_j^{class} \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and mask

 $p_j^{mask} \in \mathbb{R}^{HW}$

- Memory is decoded to N object class
- The dot product of Memory and Pixel result in *N* object masks



Hungarian Matching for Prediction-Groundtruth Association

- Goal: match the grountruth y_i to a prediction p_j
 - Ground-truth: *M* pairs of object class $y_i^{class} \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and mask $y_i^{mask} \in \mathbb{R}^{HW}$
 - Prediction: N pairs of object class $p_i^{class} \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and mask $p_i^{mask} \in \mathbb{R}^{HW}$
 - Memory is decoded to N object class
 - The dot product of Memory and Pixel result in *N* object masks
- Example:
 - Successful match: $y_i = \{ \text{dog}, f \}; p_j = \{ \text{dog}, f \}$
 - Classification accuracy = 1, and mask IoU = 1
 - Failed match: $y_i = \{ \text{dog}, \not I \}; p_j = \{ \text{dog}, \not I \}$ -> low mask loU
 - Classification accuracy = 1, but mask IoU = 0.1
 - Failed match: $y_i = \{ \text{dog}, \textbf{I}, p_j = \{ \text{cat}, \textbf{I}, \}$ -> wrong classification
 - Mask IoU=1, but classification accuracy=0

Hungarian Matching for Prediction-Groundtruth Association

- Goal: match the grountruth y_i to a prediction p_j
 - Ground-truth: *M* pairs of object class y_i^{class} and mask y_i^{mask}
 - Prediction: N pairs of object class p_i^{class} and mask p_i^{mask}
 - Memory is decoded to N object class
 - The dot product of Memory and Pixel result in *N* object masks
- Define cost matrix C of size $M \times N$

$$\circ \quad C_{i,j} = -accuracy(y_i^{class}, p_j^{class}) - IoU(y_i^{mask}, p_j^{mask})$$

- Linear assignment problem to do association
 - Formally, the task is to find a injection $f: \{1, 2, ..., m\} \rightarrow : \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ that minimizes the total assignment cost: Minimize $\sum_{i=1}^{M} C_{i,f(i)}$



Cross-attention for Stereo Matching / Fusion

- The context feature of left and right images are fused with cross-attention
- Query is left context features and key is the right context feature, or vice verse
- Reference to context-enhanced stereo Transformer [1] to estimate disparity



Context Enhanced Stereo Transformer



Fig. 3. CSTR consists of two main components:(1) Context Enhanced Path that extracts long-range context information in low resolution feature. (2) Main Matching Path that use Axial-Attention to enhance context and Cross-Attention to compute raw disparity. Then a learnable Up Sampling block up restore the original scale of disparity and Context Adjustment block refines the disparity with context information across epipolar lines conditioned on the left image.

Transformer decoder (cross-attention) is crucial in terms of an end-to-end problem formulation:





Carion, et al. End-to-end object detection with transformers. ECCV 2020. Wang, et al. MaX-DeepLab: End-to-End Panoptic Segmentation With Mask Transformers. CVPR 2021. Cheng., et al. Per-Pixel Classification is Not All You Need for Semantic Segmentation. NeurIPS 2021.

Common pipeline:

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone
- Image feature enhancement through transformer encoder (self-attention)

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone
- Image feature enhancement through transformer encoder (self-attention)
- learnable object queries aggreate pixel features through transformer decoder (cross-attention) -> box/mask embedding

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone
- Image feature enhancement through transformer encoder (self-attention)
- learnable object queries aggreate pixel features through transformer decoder (cross-attention) -> box/mask embedding
- huangarian matching for supervision assignments

Common pipeline:

- Image feature extraction through a backbone
- Image feature enhancement through transformer encoder (self-attention)
- learnable object queries aggreate pixel features through transformer decoder (cross-attention) -> box/mask embedding
- huangarian matching for supervision assignments

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attention $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p$, ixel features, with
- The update of queries is added in a residual manner.

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attention $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$ in ear project $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$
- The update of queries is added in a residual manner.

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attention $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$ ixel features, with
- The update of queries is added in a residual manner.

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attentior linear project $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p$, xel features, with
- The update of queries is added in a residual manner.

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attention $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$ ixel features, with
- The update of queries is added in a residual manner.

Cross-Attention:

- Affinity logits are computed, with linear projections, between queries (Q^c) and pixels (K^p)
- A spatial-wise (HW) softmax is applied to convert the affinity logits map to attention weights
- The attention $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^T) \times \mathbf{V}^p$, ixel features, with

As a result, the queries will be updated and converted to correspond to a specific object in prediction.

 Inconsistency of using object queries for mask prediction and updating object queries

- Sparse attention map

 Inconsistency of using object queries for mask prediction and updating object queries



- Sparse attention map

- Inconsistency of using object queries for mask prediction and updating object queries $\mathbf{Z} = \operatorname{softmax}(\mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{C}^{T}),$

updating object
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^{c} \times (\mathbf{K}^{p})^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^{p},$$

queries:

- Sparse attention map

Inconsistency of using memory queries for mask prediction and updating memory queries



MaX-DeepLab

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Cross-attention -> a clustering process

object queries -> cluster centers

attention map -> clustering assignment

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Cross-attention -> a clustering process

object queries -> cluster centers

attention map -> clustering assignment

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Cross-attention -> a clustering process

object queries -> cluster centers

attention map -> clustering assignment

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Cross-attention -> a clustering process

object queries -> cluster centers

attention map -> clustering assignment

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Machine Translation: Each object query corresponds to a word in target language, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated word in source language as its update

Panoptic Segmentation: Each object query corresponds to an object in prediction, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated pixel as its update

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Machine Translation: Each object query corresponds to a word in target language, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated word in source language as its update

Panoptic Segmentation: Each object query corresponds to an object in prediction, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated pixel as its update

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Machine Translation: Each object query corresponds to a word in target language, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated word in source language as its update

Panoptic Segmentation: Each object query corresponds to an object in prediction, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated pixel as its update objects assigned to pixels?

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW}(\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Machine Translation: Each object query corresponds to a word in target language, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated word in source language as its update

Panoptic Segmentation: Each object query corresponds to an object in prediction, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated pixel as its update

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \underset{HW}{\operatorname{softmax}} (\mathbf{Q}^{c} \times (\mathbf{K}^{p})^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^{p},$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + (\operatorname{softmax}_{N} (\tilde{\mathbf{K}}^{p} \times (\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^{c})^{\mathrm{T}}))^{\mathrm{T}} \times \mathbf{V}^{p}.$$

Panoptic Segmentation: Each object query corresponds to an object in prediction, and it will be assigned to one most affiliated pixel as its update

Panoptic Segmentation: Each pixel will choose one most affiliated object, all assigned pixels will serve as an update to corresponding object query










- Include coordinates into the clustering

Improve instance discrimination loss in MaX-DeepLab to pixel-wise contrastive loss

Achanta., et al. SLIC Superpixels Compared to State-of-the-Art Superpixel Method. TPAMI. Wang., et al. MaX-DeepLab: End-to-End Panoptic Segmentation With Mask Transformers. CVPR 2021.

We build CMT-DeepLab upon previous SOTA method MaX-DeepLab:







MaX-DeepLab



CMT-DeepLab

Summary

A novel clustering view to better understand and design Transformer modules for object-centric representation learning

We introduce CMT-DeepLab, which unfies cross-attention and panoptic segmentation from a clustering perspective

Overview

Extracting pixel-level representation:

□ Vision Transformer (ViT)



Converting to object-level representation:

 CMT-DeepLab [2] (CVPR 22 *Oral*)

kMaX-DeepLab [3](ECCV 22)

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Cross-attention:

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$

Affinity logits with linear projections

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$



$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$



$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \operatorname{softmax}_{HW} (\mathbf{Q}^c \times (\mathbf{K}^p)^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^p,$$



k-means clustering algorithm:

$$\mathbf{A} = \underset{N}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{T}}),$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{P},$$

k-means clustering algorithm:

$$\mathbf{A} = \underset{N}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{T}}),$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{P},$$

Affinity logits

k-means clustering algorithm:

$$\mathbf{A} = \underset{N}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{T}})$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{P},$$

,



k-means clustering algorithm:



k-means clustering algorithm:



cross-attention v.s. k-means clustering algorithm:



cross-attention v.s. k-means clustering algorithm:



Linear projections

Cross-attention v.s. *k-means* clustering algorithm:



cross-attention v.s. k-means clustering algorithm:



cross-attention v.s. k-means clustering algorithm:



A simple *change* for k-means cross-attention:

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \underset{HW}{\operatorname{softmax}} (\mathbf{Q}^{c} \times (\mathbf{K}^{p})^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^{p},$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C} + \underset{N}{\operatorname{argmax}} (\mathbf{Q}^{c} \times (\mathbf{K}^{p})^{\mathrm{T}}) \times \mathbf{V}^{p}.$$

A simple *change* for k-means cross-attention:



A simple *change* for k-means cross-attention:

	$\operatorname{ResNet-50}$			MaX-S		
pixel-cluster interaction module	params	FLOPs	\mathbf{PQ}	params	FLOPs	\mathbf{PQ}
cross-attention [89]	56M	165G	47.5	73M	237G	52.0
dual-path cross-attention $[92]$	58M	175G	48.0	75M	247G	52.3
k-means cross-attention	57M	168G	52.7	74M	240G	56.1
dual-path k -means cross-attention	$59\mathrm{M}$	176G	53.0	76M	248G	56.2

A simple change for k-means cross-attention:

	$\operatorname{ResNet-50}$			MaX-S		
pixel-cluster interaction module	params	FLOPs	\mathbf{PQ}	params	FLOPs	\mathbf{PQ}
cross-attention [89]	56M	165G	47.5	73M	237G	52.0
dual-path cross-attention $[92]$	58M	175G	48.0	$75\mathrm{M}$	247G	52.3
k-means cross-attention	$57\mathrm{M}$	168G	52.7	74M	$240\mathrm{G}$	56.1
dual-path k -means cross-attention	$59\mathrm{M}$	176G	53.0	76M	248G	56.2

5.2% (47.5% -> 52.7%) PQ improvement with one change and negelectable extra cost



Method	params	FLOPs	FPS	PQ
<u>MaX-DeepLab</u>	451M	3692G	-	51.1% (<mark>-6.9%</mark>)
MaskFormer	212M	792G	5.2	52.7% (- <mark>5.3%</mark>)
<u>K-Net</u>	-	_	-	54.6% (- <mark>3.4%</mark>)
<u>CMT-DeepLab</u>	270M	1114G	3.2	55.3% (- <mark>2.7%</mark>)
kMaX-DeepLab	232M	749G	6.6	58.0%

COCO val set

Method	params	FLOPs	FPS	PQ	AP ^{mask}	mloU
Panoptic-DeepLab	47M	548G	5.7	63.0% (- <mark>5.4%</mark>)	35.3% (<mark>-8.7%</mark>)	80.5% (- <mark>3.0%</mark>)
<u>Axial-DeepLab</u>	173M	2447G	-	64.4% (- <mark>4.0%</mark>)	36.7% (- <mark>7.3%</mark>)	80.6% (- <mark>2.9%</mark>)
<u>SWideRNet</u>	536M	10365G	1.0	66.4% (- <mark>2.0%</mark>)	40.1% (- <mark>3.9%</mark>)	82.2% (- <mark>1.3%</mark>)
kMaX-DeepLab	232M	1673G	3.1	68.4%	44.0%	83.5%

Cityscapes val set







Summary

Discuss the unlerlying similarity between *cross-attention* and *k-means clustering* algorithm.

Propose *k-means cross-attention*, which designs cross-attention as a k-means clustering module, leading to better *object-centric representation*.

> A simple change on *activation function* with *SOTA* performance.