

SCAN: Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network for Video Person Re-identification

Ruimao Zhang¹, Hongbin Sun², Jingyu Li², Yuying Ge², Liang Lin^{2,3}, Ping Luo¹, Xiaogang Wang¹

¹The Chinese University of Hong Kong, ²Sensetime Research, ³Sun Yat-sen University

ruimao.zhang@cuhk.edu.hk, {sunhongbin, lijingyu, geyuying}@sensetime.com

linliang@ieee.org, pluo@ie.cuhk.edu.hk, xgwang@ee.cuhk.edu.hk

Abstract

Video person re-identification attracts much attention in recent years. It aims to match image sequences of pedestrians from different camera views. Previous approaches usually improve this task from three aspects, including a) selecting more discriminative frames, b) generating more informative temporal representations, and c) developing more effective distance metrics. To address the above issues, we present a novel and practical deep architecture for video person re-identification termed Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network (SCAN). It has several appealing properties. First, SCAN adopts non-parametric attention mechanism to refine the intra-sequence and inter-sequence feature representation of videos, and outputs self-and-collaborative feature representation for each video, making the discriminative frames aligned between the probe and gallery sequences. Second, beyond existing models, a generalized pairwise similarity measurement is proposed to calculate the similarity feature representations of video pairs, enabling computing the matching scores by the binary classifier. Third, a dense clip segmentation strategy is also introduced to generate rich probe-gallery pairs to optimize the model. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of SCAN, which outperforms top-1 accuracies of the best-performing baselines by 7.8%, 2.1% and 4.9% on iLIDS-VID, PRID2011 and MARS dataset, respectively.

1. Introduction

As one of the core problems in intelligent surveillance and multimedia application, person re-identification attracts much attention in literature [47, 20, 26, 25, 38, 50]. It aims to re-identify individual persons across non-overlapping cameras distributed at different physical locations. In practice, dramatic appearance changes caused by illumination, occlusions, viewpoint and background clutter increases the difficulty of re-id task. A lot of work have been pro-




Figure 1: A comparison between a standard deep video re-identification pipeline (left) and the proposed Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network (right). For example, in the left, the CNN adopts image sequence as input and outputs the feature representation of each frames for both probe and gallery samples. Then frame selection and temporal pooling are carried out in turn. Similarity measurement of two sequences are conducted at last. In contrast, our method contains two kinds of frames selection modules. The self attention subnetwork (SAN) is used to select frames from the sequence itself to enhance its feature representation, and the collaborative attention subnetwork (CAN) is used to select frames from probe or gallery sequence based on the representation of the other one. The video-level representation is also generated in SAN and CAN. The similarity feature of two input sequences are computed in a similarity measurement module according to the outputs of SAN and CAN.

posed to deal with these problem in still images [47, 20, 26, 43, 5, 16]. Beyond this, there also exist several studies [25, 38, 50, 40] discussing the re-id task under image sequence (video) setting. Since an image sequence usually contains rich temporal information, it is more suitable to identify a person under complex environment and large geometric variations.

As shown in Fig.1, besides extracting the feature representation of each frame by convolutional neural networks (CNN), existing deep video re-identification methods usu-

Method	Frame Align.	P-G Inter.	Var. Dim.	P-G Aug.
Mc. <i>et al.</i> [25]			✓	
Zhou <i>et al.</i> [50]		✓		
Xu <i>et al.</i> [40]	✓	✓		
Liu <i>et al.</i> [24]			✓	
Li <i>et al.</i> [17]				
our method	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: The proposed SCAN integrates the benefits of the previous work into a unique framework, and also introduces some elaborate mechanisms to further improve the performance of video re-id. ‘Frame Align.’, ‘P-G Inter.’, ‘Var. Dim.’ and ‘P-G Pair Aug.’ are short for frame alignment, probe-and-gallery interaction, accepting temporal modeling with various feature dimensions (i.e. various number of frames and channels) and probe-and-gallery pair augmentation.

ally include following steps: a) selecting the discriminative video frames from probe and gallery video sequences respectively, b) generating informative temporal representation of each video, c) using video representations and learned similarity measurement to rank the video sequences in the gallery set. Most previous studies usually pay attention to one or two above steps independently.

On the other hand, several studies [50, 40] introduced the attention mechanism to video re-id task for frame selection and temporal pooling. For example, Xu *et al.* [40] adopted the attention matrix to jointly extract the discriminative frames from probe and gallery videos, and calculated the coupled probe and gallery video representations by temporal pooling operation. Although these methods achieved promising results, the attention networks are still not fully and effectively explored for temporal modeling. It can be summarized in the following aspects. First, existing methods usually generate the sequence representations after aligning probe and gallery frames (*i.e.* assigning attention weight to each frame), thus the video representation cannot in turn refine the frame selection. For example, if the probe video from person-1 has some occlusion frames with the similar appearance to the gallery video from person-2, these occlusion frames will obtain great attention in the frame alignment, and further affect final video representations. Second, some combinations of similarity measurements and loss functions in previous studies are not suitable for the attention mechanism to discover discriminative frames. Third, the attention mechanism in existing methods are usually parametric, making the length of the input sequence or the feature dimension of frames need to be fixed.

In order to address the above issues, we propose a simple but effective architecture termed Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network (SCAN) to jointly deal with frame se-

lection, temporal pooling and similarity measurement for video re-identification task. As shown in Table 1, it has several benefits that existing methods do not have. a) Compared with the recurrent neural network (RNN) based attention network, SCAN adopts attention mechanism to refine the intra-sequence and inter-sequence feature representation of sequences. Such process can efficiently align discriminative frames between the probe and gallery image sequences. The output self and collaborative feature representations leverage the global temporal information and local discriminative information. b) We propose a generalized pairwise similarity measurement in SCAN, which adopts self and collaborative video representations to calculate the similarity features of video pairs. Thus the matching problem can be transformed into a binary classification problem, and the label of an identity pair is used to optimize the classifier. Such module encourages the video features from the same identity to be similar, and enlarges the distance between informative frames and noisy frames in the same video. Moreover, different from pair-wise loss or triplet loss that needs a predefined margin constraint [6], the binary loss can reduce the cost to tune such hyperparameter. c) The attention module in SCAN is non-parametric, thus it can deal with image sequence with various lengths and the input feature dimensions of each frame is also variable. d) A dense clip segmentation strategy is introduced to generate much more probe-gallery pairs (including the hard positive and hard negative pairs) to optimize the model.

As shown on the right of Fig.1, in practice, we first extract the feature representation of each frame (green circles) from both probe and gallery videos using pre-trained CNN. Then the sequence representation (green rectangle) is calculated by average pooling according to the temporal domain. After feature extraction, we input the frame-level and sequence-level features from the probe and gallery videos into self attention subnetwork (SAN) independently. After calculating the correlation (the attention weight) between the sequence and its frames, the output sequence representation is reconstructed as a weighted sum of the frames at different temporal positions in the input sequence. The red arrow in Fig.1 denotes these two steps. We also introduce the collaborative attention subnetwork (CAN) to calculate the coupled feature representations of the input sequence pair. The calculation process of CAN is the same as the SAN, but the meaning of the output various according to different inputs. For instance, if the input sequence-level feature is from the probe video and the frame-level features are from the gallery video, the output of CAN will be the probe-driven gallery representation. Otherwise, it will be the gallery-driven probe representation. After SAN and CAN, we calculate the difference between self-representations of the probe and gallery videos, as well as the difference between their collaborative-representations. These two differ-

Method	Spatial Info.	Temporal Modeling		P-G. Inter.	Loss Func.	Identity Loss	Video Clips
		method	non-para.				
Mc. <i>et al.</i> [25]		RNN + pooling			P	✓	cons.
Zhou <i>et al.</i> [50]	✓	LSTM + attention + pooling		✓	T, B		rand.
Xu <i>et al.</i> [40]	✓	RNN + attention + pooling		✓	P	✓	cons.
Liu <i>et al.</i> [24]		weighted sum			T	✓	
Zhong <i>et al.</i> [48]		max pooling	✓	✓	P	✓	
Li <i>et al.</i> [17]	✓	weighted sum			–	✓	rand.
our method		SCAN	✓	✓	B	✓	dense

Table 2: Comparisons between proposed SCAN and other state-of-the-arts for video person re-id. ✓ represents the methods or information indicated by the column indices are adopted. ‘non-para.’ is short for non-parametrization in temporal modeling, and ‘P-G. Inter.’ for probe-gallery interaction during sequence representation generation. The uppercase ‘P’, ‘T’ and ‘B’ in the sixth column indicate pairwise loss, triplet loss and binary loss, respectively. In the last column, ‘cons.’ denotes the clip of each video is extracted from consecutive frames, and ‘rand.’ means randomly extracting several frames from the video as the clip. The ‘dense’ indicates our model segment the image sequence into multiple clips for model training.

ences are merged by the Hadamard product and fed into a fully-connected layer to calculate the final matching score.

In general, the **contribution** of this work can be summarized in three folds. (1) We propose a Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network (SCAN) to efficiently align the discriminative frames from two videos. It includes a non-parametric attention module to generate self and collaborative sequence representations by refining intra-sequence and inter-sequence features of input videos. A generalized pairwise similarity measurement is also adopted to calculate the similarity feature representations of video pairs. (2) We introduce such a module into video re-identification task, and propose a novel and practical framework to simultaneously deal with frame selection, video temporal representation and similarity measurement. In addition, a dense clip segmentation strategy is also introduced to generate much more probe-gallery pairs to optimize the model. (3) The proposed model outperforms the state-of-the-art methods with a large margin on three standard video re-identification benchmarks.

2. Related Work

Person re-identification. Person re-id in still image has been extensively explored in the literature [47, 20, 26, 21, 43, 5, 16] in the past few years. Recently, the studies about video-based person re-identification employ image sequence to further improve the matching accuracy [25, 45, 38, 50, 7, 40]. For example, McLaughlin *et al.* [25] proposed a basic pipeline for deep video re-id. It uses CNN to extract the feature of each frame. Then the RNN layer is applied to incorporate temporal context information into each frame, and the temporal pooling operation is adopted to obtain the final sequence representation. Both the identity loss and siamese loss are used to optimize parameters. In [38], Wu *et al.* proposed a similar architecture to jointly optimize

CNN and RNN to extract the spatial-temporal feature representation for similarity measurement. In recent studies, one of the remarkable property is applying the attention mechanism to discover the discriminative frames from probe and gallery videos. As shown in Table 2, Zhou *et al.* [50] proposed a temporal attention mechanism to pick out the discriminative frames for video representation. Moreover, the spatial RNN is adopted to integrate the context information from six directions to enhance the representation of each location in the feature maps. Li *et al.* [17] proposed a spatiotemporal attention model and diversity regularization to discover a set of distinctive body parts for the final video representation. In [40], Xu *et al.* introduced the shared attention matrix for temporal modeling, realizing the information exchange between probe and gallery sequence in the process of frame selection. In such case, the discriminative frames can be aligned according to their attention weights. Our method is partially related to this work. Since the proposed SCAN outputs the attention weights by leveraging global temporal information and local discriminative information, it is more robust to deal with the noise frames during alignment. On the other hand, it is a non-parametric module, thus can be more flexible to deal with sequences with various length. In [48] Zhong *et al.* also take the probe-and-gallery interaction into consideration to further improve the retrieval accuracy. However, such interaction is exploited in the re-ranking stage, and the attention mechanism is also omitted.

Self-attention and interaction network. Recent developed self-attention [30] mechanism for machine translation is also related to our work. It calculated the response at one position as a weighted sum of all positions in the sentence. The similarity idea was also introduced in Interaction Networks (IN) [2, 35, 14] for modeling the pairwise interactions in physical systems. Recently, Wang *et al.*




Figure 2: Architecture of proposed Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network. This architecture is comprised of four parts: shared convolution neural networks, self attention subnetwork (SAN), collaborative attention subnetwork (CAN) and similarity measurement module. The video clips from probe and gallery image sequences are first fed into CNN to obtain frame-level features. Then SAN and CAN are adopted to generate video-level representation according to the non-parametric attention mechanism. At last, the binary cross-entropy loss and identity loss are used to optimize the parameters of SCAN. Zoom in four times for best view.

al. [33] extended these methods into computer vision area, and proposed the Non-Local Network to model the long-range spatial and temporal dependencies in a single block. In [49], Zhou *et al.* proposed the Temporal Relation Network (TRN) to learn temporal dependencies between video frames at multiple time scales. The proposed SCAN is inspired by above two works, but we further introduce the collaborative representation mechanism to deal with the matching problem.

Collaborative representation. Learning collaborative representation aims to represent a sample as a weighted linear combination of all training samples. It has been successfully applied in many computer vision tasks, such as face recognition [37, 44], super-resolution [27], image denoising [4] and so on. In this paper, we introduce a collaborative representation into temporal modeling, and combine it with deep neural networks for end-to-end training. Specially, self and collaborative attention network are proposed to represent the video as a weighted combination of multiple frames.

Similarity learning. Learning the similarity metric is a natural solution for matching problem. Traditional metric learning methods [10, 36, 8, 41] usually learned a common space for visual data from different domains. Instead of using hand-craft feature, many work [19, 1, 34, 22] integrated the feature learning and metric learning into deep neural networks. Our model is partially motivated by the above work. However, the proposed SCAN aims to incorporate a parameter free similarity function into deep models to align the discriminative frames in probe and gallery videos.

3. Methodology

In this section, we first present the deep architecture of proposed model in Sec. 3.1, Then the connection between our method and traditional metric learning are presented in Sec. 3.2. Sec. 3.3 gives more implementation details about the proposed method.

3.1. Deep Architecture

Feature extraction. The deep architecture of proposed method is illustrated in Fig. 2. Supposing the probe image sequence is represented as $\mathbf{I}_p = \{\mathbf{I}_p^t\}_{t=1}^T$ and the gallery sequence is as $\mathbf{I}_g = \{\mathbf{I}_g^r\}_{r=1}^R$. T and R indicate the length of the image sequences. The probe and gallery sequences are at first fed into CNN to extract the feature representation of each frame. The parameters of CNN are shared for both sequences. Let the feature representation of the probe and gallery video be $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}^t | \mathbf{x}^t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}^r | \mathbf{y}^r \in \mathbb{R}^d\}_{r=1}^R$, where d is the dimension of the feature vector and is set as 2048 in practice. We further apply the $fc-0$ layer to reduce the feature dimension to 128 and denote them as $\mathbf{X}_f = \{\mathbf{x}_f^t\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\mathbf{Y}_f = \{\mathbf{y}_f^r\}_{r=1}^R$, respectively.

Self Attention Subnetwork. After feature extraction, the Self Attention Network (SAN) is adopted to select the informative frames to further enhance the representation of each image sequence. We first feed $\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_f\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}_f\}$ into SAN. Then the dimension of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} is reduced from 2048 to 128 using $fc-1$ layer and denoted as $\mathbf{X}_s = \{\mathbf{x}_s^t\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\mathbf{Y}_s = \{\mathbf{y}_s^r\}_{r=1}^R$. After that, the sequence-level representation of \mathbf{X}_s and \mathbf{Y}_s are produced through *average pooling* over the temporal dimension. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_s$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_s$ be the sequence-level feature vector of probe and gallery video in

SAN, we further enhance these feature representations by,

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx} = \sum_{t=1}^T f(\mathbf{x}_s^t, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_s) \circ \mathbf{x}_f^t \quad \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy} = \sum_{r=1}^R f(\mathbf{y}_s^r, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_s) \circ \mathbf{y}_f^r \quad (1)$$

where $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a parameter-free correlation function, which outputs the correlation weight of input features. It may have various forms [33]. In this paper, we adopt *Hadamard product* to calculate the correlation weight, thus the output of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the correlation weight vector and \circ indicates the Hadamard product. The *softmax* operation along the temporal dimension (t and r) is also used for normalizing these weights. The subscript xx indicates the probe-driven probe representation, while yy indicates the gallery-driven gallery representation. The output $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy}$ are then passed into collaborative attention subnetwork.

Collaborative Attention Subnetwork. The input of CAN is from two branches. One is the sequence-level representation $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy}$ from SAN, and the other is the frame-level representations $\{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_f\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}_f\}$ from CNN. Same as SAN, we reduce the dimension of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} from 2048 to 128 using *fc-2* layer in CAN. The outputs are $\mathbf{X}_c = \{\mathbf{x}_c^t\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\mathbf{Y}_c = \{\mathbf{y}_c^r\}_{r=1}^R$. Then the cross-camera feature representation can be computed as,

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{yx} = \sum_{t=1}^T f(\mathbf{x}_c^t, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy}) \circ \mathbf{x}_f^t \quad \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{xy} = \sum_{r=1}^R f(\mathbf{y}_c^r, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx}) \circ \mathbf{y}_f^r \quad (2)$$

The subscript xy indicates the probe driven gallery representation, and yx is the gallery driven probe representation. The operation in Eqn.(2) enables probe and gallery video to effectively select discriminative frames from each other.

Similarity measurement. We use the output of SAN and CAN to calculate the similarity feature representation between probe sequence and gallery sequence as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s} &= (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy}) \circ (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{yx} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{xy}) \\ &= (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx} \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{yx} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy} \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{yx}) + (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{yy} \circ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{xy} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{xx} \circ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{xy}) \\ &= (\mathbf{X}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xx} \circ \mathbf{X}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yx} - \mathbf{Y}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yy} \circ \mathbf{X}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yx}) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{Y}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yy} \circ \mathbf{Y}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xy} - \mathbf{X}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xx} \circ \mathbf{Y}_f \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xy}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xx}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yy}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{xy}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{yx}$ denotes the combination coefficient matrices calculated by the non-parameter correlation function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. The meaning of subscripts are consistent with that in the sequence-level representation. The operation \cdot indicates weighted combination along each feature dimension, and \circ denotes the Hadamard product. Note that \mathbf{s} is a vector but not a scalar, which indicates the sequence-level similarity after frame selection. This feature representation is then transformed by a fully-connected layer, i.e. *fc-3* layer, to obtain the final matching score. At last, we




Figure 3: Merging strategy of RGB and optical flow branch.

adopt identity pair annotation and binary cross-entropy loss to optimize the matching score,

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [l_i \log m_i + (1 - l_i) \log(1 - m_i)] \quad (4)$$

where N is the number of probe-gallery pairs in the training set. m_i is the predicted matching score of i -th pair, and l_i indicates its label. If the probe video and gallery video present the same person identity, the value of l_i is 1, else it will be 0. The same operation is also used in textual-visual matching problem [18].

3.2. Compared with Traditional Metric Learning

According to [22], the generalized linear similarity of two feature vectors can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s} &= [\mathbf{x}^T \quad \mathbf{y}^T] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & -\mathbf{C} \\ -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \underbrace{[(\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x})^T \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x} - (\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_y \mathbf{y})^T \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_x \mathbf{x}]}_{\text{Part A}} + \underbrace{[(\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{y})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{y} - (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_x \mathbf{x})^T \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_y \mathbf{y}]}_{\text{Part B}} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ and \mathbf{D} are the parameters to be optimized, and $\mathbf{A} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{C} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_x^T \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_y$ and $\mathbf{D} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_y^T \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_x$. When $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{M}^T$, it degenerates into Mahalanobis distance with the form $\tilde{s} = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{M} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$. Intuitively, Eqn.(3) has a very similar form with Eqn.(5). The differences are three folds: First, we replace $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ in *Part A* and *Part B* with two sets of frame-level feature representations \mathbf{X}_f and \mathbf{Y}_f , respectively. Second, we rewrite feature vector \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} as the linear combination coefficients $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_{\cdot}$ computed by correlation function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, which uses sequence-level feature representation as anchors to calculate the correlation weights between frame-level features and the corresponding sequence-level features. At last, some dot product operations are replaced by element-wise product.

In fact, our method adopts the temporal attention mechanism to project two image sequences into a compact ‘frame

Name		Layer	Output Size
conv ₁		7 × 7, 64, stride 2	2 × 10 × 128 × 64 × 64
pool ₁		3 × 3, max pool, stride 2	2 × 10 × 64 × 32 × 64
res ₂		$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \times 1, & 64 \\ 3 \times 3, & 64 \\ 1 \times 1, & 256 \end{bmatrix} \times 3$	2 × 10 × 64 × 32 × 256
res ₃		$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \times 1, & 128 \\ 3 \times 3, & 128 \\ 1 \times 1, & 512 \end{bmatrix} \times 4$	2 × 10 × 32 × 26 × 512
res ₄		$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \times 1, & 256 \\ 3 \times 3, & 256 \\ 1 \times 1, & 1024 \end{bmatrix} \times 6$	2 × 10 × 16 × 8 × 1024
res ₅		$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \times 1, & 512 \\ 3 \times 3, & 512 \\ 1 \times 1, & 2048 \end{bmatrix} \times 3$	2 × 10 × 8 × 4 × 2048
pool _s		average pool	2 × 10 × 1 × 2048
fc ₀		2048 × 128	2 × 10 × 1 × 128
SAN	fc ₁	2048 × 128	2 × 10 × 1 × 128
	pool ₂	average pool	2 × 1 × 1 × 128
	self-atten	hadamard product	2 × 10 × 1 × 128
	reconst.	weighted sum	2 × 1 × 1 × 128
CAN	fc ₂	2048 × 128	2 × 10 × 1 × 128
	colla-atten	hadamard product	2 × 10 × 1 × 128
	reconst.	weighted sum	2 × 1 × 1 × 128
similarity		element operation	1 × 1 × 1 × 128
output fc		128 × 2	1 × 1 × 1 × 2

Table 3: The architecture of proposed **SCAN**. The basic model is ResNet50 [11]. The dimensions of the output indicate the number of the clips, the number of the frames in each clip, the height and width of feature maps and the number of channels, respectively. The optical flow is omitted.

space’ to align the discriminative frames in the probe and gallery videos, and use these discriminative frames to generate the final representations of the videos. It is essentially different between our method and previous metric learning work, which projects the data into a common feature space by using linear transformations and output the distance to indicate the matching score. That is also the reason that the output of Eqn.(3) is a similarity feature vector of two image sequences but not a distance. In this sense, our work bridges the metric learning for feature projection with the temporal frame selection, which is a common technique in a series of video-based applications.

3.3. Implementation Details

Clip Segmentation. In practice, we segment every image sequence into several video clips. The length of each clip is

10 and the segmentation stride is set as 5 in training and test procedure. When the frames at the end of the video are not sufficient to generate the clip, we discard the rest frames directly. The advantage of such pre-processing strategy are as follows: (a) It can generate a large amount of probe-gallery pairs to optimize network parameters, which is critical for the deep model training. Specially, it is beneficial to produce much more hard positive/negative training pairs to promote the training efficiency. (b) It avoids loading the entire image sequence into the model for temporal modeling. In such case, when the batch size is fixed, it can increase the diversity of minibatch effectively. This ensures the training process more stable and BatchNorm (BN) [15] more efficient to accelerate the model convergence. In the test phase, we select 20 snippet pairs with the highest matching score from coupled image sequences and average these 20 matching scores as the final confidence score. We rank all of the confidence scores and return the final ranking list to calculate the matching accuracy.

Training process. The architecture of proposed **SCAN** is shown in Table 3. All of the CNN models in this work are pre-trained on ImageNet [9]. We fine-tune the models using 16 identities in each batch. Each person corresponds to 2 video snippets. In summary, there are 32 clips with 320 video frames as the input for each iteration. The input frames are resized into 256 × 128 pixels. Horizontal flipping is also used for data augmentation. We adopt Online Instance Matching (OIM) [39] loss as the identity loss function. We train our models on 4-GPU machine. Each model is optimized 30 epoches in total, and the initial learning rate is set as 0.001. The learning rate is updated with the form, $lr = lr_0 \times 0.001^{(epoch/10)}$, where lr_0 denotes the initial learning rate. We use a momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of 0.0001. The parameters in BN layers are also updated in the training phase.

4. Experiments

We have conducted extensive experiments to clarify the superiority of proposed method. In this section, the experimental setting, experimental results and ablation analysis are presented in Sec. 4.1, Sec. 4.2 and Sec. 4.3.

4.1. Experimental Setting

Datasets: We evaluate the performance of proposed method on three well known video re-identification benchmarks: **the iLIDS-VID dataset** [32], **the PRID 2011 dataset** [13] and **the MARS dataset** [45]. (a) iLIDS-VID contains 600 image sequences of 300 pedestrians under two cameras. Each image sequence has 23 to 192 frames. Both of the training and test set have 150 identities. (b) PRID is another standard benchmark for video re-identification. It consists of 300 identities and each has 2 image sequences. The length of sequences varies from

Methods	Source	Deep model	iLIDS-VID			
			top-1	top-5	top-10	top-20
1. LFDA [26]	cvpr13	no	32.9	68.5	82.2	92.6
2. LADF [20]	cvpr13	no	39.0	76.8	89.0	96.8
3. STFV3D [23]	iccv15	no	44.3	71.7	83.7	91.7
4. TDL [42]	cvpr16	no	56.3	87.6	95.6	98.3
5. CNN-RNN [25]	cvpr16	yes	58.0	84.0	91.0	96.0
6. CNN+XQDA [45]	eccv16	yes	53.0	81.4	–	95.1
7. TAM+SRM [50]	cvpr17	yes	55.2	86.5	–	97.0
8. ASTPN [40]	iccv17	yes	62.0	86.0	94.0	98.0
9. QAN [24]	cvpr17	yes	68.0	86.8	95.4	97.4
10. RQEN [29]	aaai18	yes	77.1	93.2	97.7	99.4
11. STAN [17]	cvpr18	yes	80.2	–	–	–
12. ours w/o optical	–	yes	81.3	93.3	96.0	98.0
13. ours w/ optical	–	yes	88.0	96.7	98.0	100.0

Table 4: Performance comparison on the iLIDS-VID by state-of-the-art methods. Our model is based on ResNet50. Top-1, -5, -10, -20 accuracies(%) are reported.

5 to 675. (c) MARS is one of the largest video person re-identification dataset which contains 1,261 different pedestrians and 20,715 tracklets captured from 6 cameras. In this dataset, each person has one probe under each camera, resulting in 2,009 probes in total. The dataset is divided into training and test sets that contains 631 and 630 persons respectively.

Evaluation Metric: Two widely used evaluation metrics are used for comparison. The first is the cumulative matching characteristic (CMC) [3], which considers re-id as the ranking problem. Since the tracklets in MARS dataset are captured from 6 camera, the ranking list may contain multiple matching results. Thus we also adopt mean average precision (mAP) [46] to evaluate the performance in this dataset. In this case, the re-id problem is regarded as the retrieval problem.

Optical Flow: For fair comparison and further improving the performance of video re-id, we use the optical flow [31, 28] to extract the motion information from image sequence. In practice, the dimension of input optical flow for each frame is $2 * H * W$, where 2 denotes the number of vertical and horizontal channels. H and W indicate the height and width of the map. The value range of optical flow is scaled to 0 to 255. Through one convolution layer (with BN and ReLU operation) and one pooling layer, the dimension of feature maps in optical branch becomes $64 * \frac{1}{4}H * \frac{1}{4}W$, which is same as RGB branch. Then an element-wise addition is applied to merge these two modalities, and the outputs are fed into the rest layers. Fig. 3 illustrates the operation.

4.2. Comparison with State-of-the-arts

We firstly report the comparison of proposed method with existing eleven state-of-the-art video person re-identification methods on iLIDS-VID dataset and PRID2011 dataset, including LFDA [26], LADF [20], STFV3D [23], TDL [42], CNN-RNN [25], CNN+XQDA [45], TAM+SRM [50], ASTPN [40], QAN [24], RQEN [29] and STAN [17]. The first four methods are traditional methods without using deep models, while the others adopt deep neural networks to extract the feature representation of each frame. We use ResNet50 [11] as the basic model of proposed SCAN. Following [40], each dataset is randomly split into 50% of identities for training and others for testing. All experiments are repeated 10 times with different train/test splits, and the averaged results are reported. As shown in Table 4 and Table 5, our method achieves state of the art 88.0% and 95.3% top-1 accuracy on iLIDS-VID and PRID2011, outperforming the existing best method STAN [17] with 7.8% and 2.1%, respectively.

To further demonstrate the effectiveness of SCAN on the data captured from multiple camera views, we compare it with state-of-the-arts on MARS dataset, including CNN+Kissme+MQ [45], Latent Parts [16], TAM+SRM [50], QAN [24], K-Recip. [48], TriNet [12], RQEN [29] and STAN [17]. Table 6 reports the retrieval results. Our approach outperforms previous state-of-the-arts on top-1 accuracy and mAP, and obtains 4.9% and 11.4% improvement.

4.3. Ablation Study

To investigate the efficacy of proposed SCAN, we conduct ablation experiments on iLIDS-VID, PRID2011 and

Methods	Source	Deep model	PRID2011			
			top-1	top-5	top-10	top-20
1. LFDA [26]	cvpr13	no	43.7	72.8	81.7	90.9
2. LADF [20]	cvpr13	no	47.3	75.5	82.7	91.1
3. STFV3D [23]	iccv15	no	64.7	87.3	89.9	92.0
4. TDL [42]	cvpr16	no	56.7	80.0	87.6	93.6
5. CNN-RNN [25]	cvpr16	yes	70.0	90.0	95.0	97.0
6. CNN+XQDA [45]	eccv16	yes	77.3	93.5	–	99.3
7. TAM+SRM [50]	cvpr17	yes	79.4	94.4	–	99.3
8. ASTPN [40]	iccv17	yes	77.0	95.0	99.0	99.0
9. QAN [24]	cvpr17	yes	90.3	98.2	99.3	100.0
10. RQEN [29]	aaai18	yes	91.8	98.4	99.3	99.8
11. STAN [17]	cvpr18	yes	93.2	–	–	–
12. ours w/o optical	–	yes	92.0	98.0	100.0	100.0
13. ours w/ optical	–	yes	95.3	99.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5: Performance comparison on the PRID2011 by state-of-the-art methods. Our model is based on ResNet50. Top-1, -5, -10, -20 accuracies(%) are reported.

Methods	Source	Deep model	MARS			
			top-1	top-5	top-20	mAP
1. CNN+Kiss.+MQ [45]	eccv16	yes	68.3	82.6	89.4	49.3
2. Latent Parts [16]	cvpr17	yes	71.8	86.6	93.0	56.1
3. TAM+SRM [50]	cvpr17	yes	70.6	90.0	97.6	50.7
4. QAN [24]	cvpr17	yes	73.7	84.9	91.6	51.7
5. K-reciprocal [48]	cvpr17	yes	73.9	–	–	68.5
6. TriNet [12]	arxiv17	yes	79.8	91.4	–	67.7
7. RQEN [29]	aaai18	yes	77.8	88.8	94.3	71.1
8. STAN [17]	cvpr18	yes	82.3	–	–	65.8
9. ours w/o optical	–	yes	86.6	94.8	97.1	76.7
10. ours w/ optical	–	yes	87.2	95.2	98.1	77.2

Table 6: Performance comparison on the MARS by state-of-the-art methods. Our model is based on ResNet50. Top-1, -5, -20 accuracies(%) and mAP(%) are reported.

MARS dataset. The average pooling over temporal dimension is used to be our baseline model if not specified. The overall results are shown on Table 7. We also consider the impact of the cutting length of video clips. The comparison results are shown in Table 8.

Instantiations. We compared our full model with five simplified settings, including (1) using the average pooling over temporal dimension to calculate the feature representation of both the probe and gallery sequences; (2) using max pooling to replace average pooling in (1); (3) using Self Attention Network (SAN) to compute probe and gallery video features separately; (4) using average pooling to obtain the video-level feature representation firstly, and using Collaborative Attention Network (CAN) to reconstruct probe and gallery video representations; (5) using SAN to calculate probe video feature, followed by employing such feature representation to reconstruct gallery video representation by

CAN. This setting can be viewed as a *single-path* variant of the proposed SCAN. For all of the above methods, we adopt the difference between two obtained video features as the similarity representation, and apply loss function in Eqn. 4 for optimization.

According to Table 7, we have several important findings. First, the baseline model (*i.e.* ave. pooling) has already outperformed state-of-the-art methods with a margin. It demonstrates the effectiveness of proposed pipeline, including clip segmentation and binary cross-entropy loss in Eqn.(4). Second, the matching accuracy achieves a slightly improvement when only using SAN or CAN for temporal modeling, but *single path* SCAN outperforms the baseline with a margin. It suggests that the SAN and CAN modules are coupled when aligning the discriminative frames in the probe and gallery image sequences. At last, the performance of the *single-path* SCAN is less than our

Seetings	iLIDS-VID			PRID2011			MARS		
	top-1	top-5	mAP	top-1	top-5	mAP	top-1	top-5	mAP
1. ave. pooling	81.3	95.3	84.5	92.0	100.0	93.6	83.4	93.2	75.1
2. max pooling	82.0	96.0	85.2	92.0	100.0	93.6	83.6	93.1	75.0
3. SAN only	82.7	97.3	85.7	92.0	99.0	93.8	84.2	94.7	75.4
4. CAN only	83.3	96.0	84.3	92.0	100.0	93.5	85.4	95.1	75.7
5. SCAN <i>single path</i>	86.7	96.7	88.5	93.4	99.0	94.6	86.1	95.1	76.3
6. our full model	88.0	96.7	89.9	95.3	99.0	95.8	87.2	95.2	77.2

Table 7: Comparison of different temporal modeling methods. Top-1, -5 accuracies(%) and mAP(%) are reported.

Seetings	iLIDS-VID			PRID2011			MARS		
	top-1	top-5	mAP	top-1	top-5	mAP	top-1	top-5	mAP
a. 10-frames 5-stride	88.0	96.7	89.9	95.3	99.0	95.8	87.2	95.2	77.2
b. 16-frames 8-stride	85.3	95.3	87.8	94.0	99.0	94.5	86.3	95.1	75.8
c. 20-frames 10-stride	78.0	96.0	81.4	89.0	100.0	91.3	85.5	94.8	75.4

Table 8: Setting the length of video clips is critical. The ‘stride’ denotes the overlap of two consecutive clips. Top-1, -5 accuracies(%) and mAP(%) are reported.

full model, reflecting the importance of generalized similarity representation between probe and gallery sequences in the matching problem.

Video clip with different length. We also investigate the performance of the SCAN model using different length of video clips. We cut the input image sequence into several clips with 10 frames, 16 frames and 20 frames, and the number of overlapped frames (*i.e.*, the stride of the sliding window over the temporal dimension) is set as 5, 8 and 10, respectively. In Table 8, the setting with 10 frames achieves the best performance over all of the evaluation metrics. We can also observe that as the clip length grows, the accuracy drops gradually. It demonstrates the cutting strategy can provide more diverse pairs in the minibatch, which increases the model capacity effectively.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a novel Self-and-Collaborative Attention Network for video person re-identification, which integrates frame selection, temporal pooling and similarity measurement into a simple but effective module. Different from traditional metric learning method that project the video-level representations into a common feature space for similarity measurement, SCAN adopts the proposed generalized similarity measurement to align two image sequences in the ‘*frame space*’, and generates the final representation with the selected discriminative frames. Extensive experiments demonstrate the proposed SCAN outperforms the state-of-the-art methods.

Several directions can be considered to further improve our model. First, extending SCAN into the spatial-temporal dimension is an intuitive idea. Second, how to efficiently

integrate the multi-modality information, e.g., RGB and optical flow, into a single framework is still an open issue. At last, combining proposed method with other visual tasks, such as video object detection or video-based instance segmentation, is also an exciting research direction.

References

- [1] E. Ahmed, M. Jones, and T. K. Marks. An improved deep learning architecture for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2015. 4
- [2] P. W. Battaglia, R. Pascanu, M. Lai, D. J. Rezende, and K. Kavukcuoglu. Interaction networks for learning about objects, relations and physics. In *NIPS*, 2016. 3
- [3] R. M. Bolle, J. H. Connell, S. Pankanti, N. K. Ratha, and A. W. Senior. The relation between the ROC curve and the CMC. In *AUTOID*, 2005. 7
- [4] A. Buades, B. Coll, and J. Morel. A non-local algorithm for image denoising. In *CVPR*, 2005. 4
- [5] D. Chen, Z. Yuan, B. Chen, and N. Zheng. Similarity learning with spatial constraints for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1, 3
- [6] W. Chen, X. Chen, J. Zhang, and K. Huang. Beyond triplet loss: A deep quadruplet network for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2017. 2
- [7] D. Chung, K. Tahboub, and E. J. Delp. A two stream siamese convolutional neural network for person re-identification. In *ICCV*, 2017. 3
- [8] J. V. Davis, B. Kulis, P. Jain, S. Sra, and I. S. Dhillon. Information-theoretic metric learning. In *ICML*, 2007. 4
- [9] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L. Li, K. Li, and F. Li. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009. 6
- [10] A. Globerson and S. T. Roweis. Metric learning by collapsing classes. In *NIPS*, 2005. 4

- [11] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016. 6, 7
- [12] A. Hermans, L. Beyer, and B. Leibe. In defense of the triplet loss for person re-identification. *Arxiv*, abs/1703.07737, 2017. 7, 8
- [13] M. Hirzer, C. Beleznaï, P. M. Roth, and H. Bischof. Person re-identification by descriptive and discriminative classification. In *SCIA*, 2011. 6
- [14] Y. Hoshen. VAIN: attentional multi-agent predictive modeling. In *NIPS*, 2017. 3
- [15] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *ICML*, 2015. 6
- [16] D. Li, X. Chen, Z. Zhang, and K. Huang. Learning deep context-aware features over body and latent parts for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2017. 1, 3, 7, 8
- [17] S. Li, S. Bak, P. Carr, C. Hetang, and X. Wang. Diversity regularized spatiotemporal attention for video-based person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2, 3, 7, 8
- [18] S. Li, T. Xiao, H. Li, W. Yang, and X. Wang. Identity-aware textual-visual matching with latent co-attention. In *ICCV*, 2017. 5
- [19] W. Li, R. Zhao, T. Xiao, and X. Wang. Deepreid: Deep filter pairing neural network for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2014. 4
- [20] Z. Li, S. Chang, F. Liang, T. S. Huang, L. Cao, and J. R. Smith. Learning locally-adaptive decision functions for person verification. In *CVPR*, 2013. 1, 3, 7, 8
- [21] S. Liao, Y. Hu, X. Zhu, and S. Z. Li. Person re-identification by local maximal occurrence representation and metric learning. In *CVPR*, 2015. 3
- [22] L. Lin, G. Wang, W. Zuo, X. Feng, and L. Zhang. Cross-domain visual matching via generalized similarity measure and feature learning. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(6):1089–1102, 2017. 4, 5
- [23] K. Liu, B. Ma, W. Zhang, and R. Huang. A spatio-temporal appearance representation for video-based pedestrian re-identification. In *ICCV*, 2015. 7, 8
- [24] Y. Liu, J. Yan, and W. Ouyang. Quality aware network for set to set recognition. In *CVPR*, 2017. 2, 3, 7, 8
- [25] N. McLaughlin, J. M. del Rincón, and P. C. Miller. Recurrent convolutional network for video-based person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8
- [26] S. Pedagadi, J. Orwell, S. A. Velastin, and B. A. Boghossian. Local fisher discriminant analysis for pedestrian re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2013. 1, 3, 7, 8
- [27] M. Protter, M. Elad, H. Takeda, and P. Milanfar. Generalizing the nonlocal-means to super-resolution reconstruction. *IEEE Trans. Image Processing*, 18(1):36–51, 2009. 4
- [28] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman. Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. In *NIPS*, 2014. 7
- [29] G. Song, B. Leng, Y. Liu, C. Hetang, and S. Cai. Region-based quality estimation network for large-scale person re-identification. In *AAAI*, 2018. 7, 8
- [30] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, 2017. 3
- [31] L. Wang, Y. Xiong, Z. Wang, Y. Qiao, D. Lin, X. Tang, and L. V. Gool. Temporal segment networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition. In *ECCV*, 2016. 7
- [32] T. Wang, S. Gong, X. Zhu, and S. Wang. Person re-identification by video ranking. In *ECCV*, 2014. 6
- [33] X. Wang, R. Girshick, A. Gupta, and K. He. Non-local neural networks. In *CVPR*, 2018. 4, 5
- [34] X. Wang, K. He, and A. Gupta. Transitive invariance for self-supervised visual representation learning. In *ICCV*, 2017. 4
- [35] N. Watters, A. Tacchetti, T. Weber, R. Pascanu, P. Battaglia, and D. Zoran. Visual interaction networks. In *NIPS*, 2017. 3
- [36] K. Q. Weinberger and L. K. Saul. Distance metric learning for large margin nearest neighbor classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:207–244, 2009. 4
- [37] J. Wright, A. Y. Yang, A. Ganesh, S. S. Sastry, and Y. Ma. Robust face recognition via sparse representation. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 31(2):210–227, 2009. 4
- [38] L. Wu, C. Shen, and A. van den Hengel. Deep recurrent convolutional networks for video-based person re-identification: An end-to-end approach. *arXiv*, abs/1606.01609, 2016. 1, 3
- [39] T. Xiao, S. Li, B. Wang, L. Lin, and X. Wang. Joint detection and identification feature learning for person search. In *CVPR*, 2017. 6
- [40] S. Xu, Y. Cheng, K. Gu, Y. Yang, S. Chang, and P. Zhou. Jointly attentive spatial-temporal pooling networks for video-based person re-identification. In *ICCV*, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8
- [41] Y. Ying and P. Li. Distance metric learning with eigenvalue optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:1–26, 2012. 4
- [42] J. You, A. Wu, X. Li, and W. Zheng. Top-push video-based person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2016. 7, 8
- [43] L. Zhang, T. Xiang, and S. Gong. Learning a discriminative null space for person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1, 3
- [44] L. Zhang, M. Yang, and X. Feng. Sparse representation or collaborative representation: Which helps face recognition? In *ICCV*, 2011. 4
- [45] L. Zheng, Z. Bie, Y. Sun, J. Wang, C. Su, S. Wang, and Q. Tian. MARS: A video benchmark for large-scale person re-identification. In *ECCV*, 2016. 3, 6, 7, 8
- [46] L. Zheng, L. Shen, L. Tian, S. Wang, J. Wang, and Q. Tian. Scalable person re-identification: A benchmark. In *ICCV*, 2015. 7
- [47] W. Zheng, S. Gong, and T. Xiang. Person re-identification by probabilistic relative distance comparison. In *CVPR*, 2011. 1, 3
- [48] Z. Zhong, L. Zheng, D. Cao, and S. Li. Re-ranking person re-identification with k-reciprocal encoding. In *CVPR*, 2017. 3, 7, 8
- [49] B. Zhou, A. Andonian, and A. Torralba. Temporal relational reasoning in videos. *arXiv*, abs/1711.08496, 2017. 4
- [50] Z. Zhou, Y. Huang, W. Wang, L. Wang, and T. Tan. See the forest for the trees: Joint spatial and temporal recurrent neural networks for video-based person re-identification. In *CVPR*, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8