ETHZURICH



Cross-Modal Filters for RGB-Neuromorphic Wormhole Learning

Alessandro Zanardi¹, Andreas Aumiller¹, Julian Zilly¹, Andrea Censi^{1,} Emilio Frazzoli¹ ¹Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zurich

1 Introduction

The technique of "wormhole learning" [1] shows that even temporary access to a different sensor with complementary invariance

4 RGB- Neuromorphic Results



characteristics can be used to enlarge the operating domain of an existing object detector without the use of additional training data.







2 Wormhole Learning



Fig. 3. To compute a cross-modal filter between RGB and event-based camera it is sufficient to check whether or not the generation model for the two sensors is respected. Events are expected to appear at edge location and vice-versa. Thus, we introduce an edge overlap score (S_{eo}) to quantify how much the two models are fulfilled. This can be consider a proxy evaluating how much the objects are observable in both domains. In the figure above the gradient of the RGB image is pointwise compared with the events' activity.

Hence, we have $xlf_{a \rightarrow b} = S_{eo} > \underline{S_{eo}}$ where $S_{eo} = \frac{\sum_{BOX} \sqrt{|I_{EB}|||\nabla I_{RGB}||}}{\sum_{BOX} \sqrt{||\nabla I_{RGB}||}}$

Table 1Detection performance in mAP@0.5IoU					
Testset	RGB (D)	Event- based	RGB (D+N)	Relative Gain	
Day (D)	59.1	26.2	58.1	-2%	
Night (N)	32.2	16.2	41.5	+29%	

Table 2Detection performance of event-based detector as afunction of the XLF threshold [mAP@0.5IoU]

Testset	None	Low threshold	Higl
			threshold

- Same pattern observed in [1] with RGB-IR, we compromise a bit of performance at day (-2%) to significantly improve at night (+29%).
- We observe a positive gain in spite of the middle modality being not particularly apt to the task.
- Tab. 2 shows the effectiveness of XLF for the first transfer learning step. Instead, we did not experience particular need for any filter when

Fig. 1. The principle of wormhole learning is illustrated.

It begins with a detector that works only in a limited region of the operating environment, in this case, the bottom left circle (RGB detector at day time). The ultimate goal is to make it **more robust with respect to a certain nuisance**, hence, expanding its operating envelope. In this case, the nuisance is the ambient illumination. The goal is achieved in a **completely automated fashion with the temporary addition of an auxiliary sensor**. In the following the **three key points** are presented:

- 1. Starting from the bottom left, **transfer learning** is applied to learn a detector in the auxiliary domain. As training labels we adopt the inferences generated by the RGB detector. **The result is an even-based object detector**.
- 2. From there, **the inherent invariance of the new domain to the specific nuisance of illumination** allows us to "travel" across the operating domain. The event-based object detector is now able to **perform inference also at night**.
- 3. In the final step the student becomes the teacher, and symmetrically to step one, we retrain the RGB detector at daytime from the event-based inferred labels at night. We can now remove the auxiliary sensor and we are left with an RGB detector that works both at day and night.

In order to cope with sensors that are radically different, such as RGB cameras and event-based neuromorphic sensors, we need a more careful selection of which samples to transfer. Thus we design "cross-modal learning filters" which represents a first step in the relatively unexplored territory of multi-modal observability.

3 Cross-Modal Filters

Day	20.5	26.2(+27.5%)	22.5(+9.4%)
Night	8.23	16.2(+97.1%)	18.6(+126%)

going from events to RGB.

Fig. 4. On the left the effect of XLF with low threshold, on the right with high threshold. Increasing the threshold progressively removes objects that appear less observable.

Fig. 5. Recall-precision curves for category *car* and *person*. In **blue** the detector after WHL, in **orange** the detector before WHL. For *cars* we can appreciate a **significant improvement in performance at night** that exceeds the 95% confidence bound (dashed-line). On the other hand, *persons* do not exhibit an equally remarkable improvement, we could speculate that the representation of a car changes more when switching from day to night than a person which does not exhibit new features such as headlights and shimmering lights.

5 Conclusion

$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z}_{a})$

We generalize the wormhole learning algorithm by introducing **cross-modal learning filters (XLFs)**, which are functions of the type: $xlf_{a \to b}: Z_a \times Z_b \times Y \to Bool$

Fig. 2 Given a detection in one domain, cross-modal filters tell us whether or not that label should be used as training sample for the other domain. Note that this is not the same as a detector since it is conditioned on having had a detection on one sensor. Graphically, among the four mutually exclusive cases we are reconstructing the decision boundary only between region B and C. These results on wormhole learning show that there are many creative ways to combine the data from heterogeneous sensors, and an additional sensor can be useful, even if you only have it during training, and even if it is not particularly good at the task at hand, or, equivalently, even if we do not know how to use it well for the task at hand.

The results suggest that we are still in the **early days of multi-modal perception** and many questions are still to be answered.

6 References

- 1. A. Zanardi, J. Zilly, A. Aumiller, A. Censi, E. Frazzoli, "Wormhole learning," IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2019.
- 2. A. Zanardi, A. Aumiller, J. Zilly, A. Censi, E. Frazzoli, "Cross-Modal Learning Filters for RGB-Neuromorphic Wormhole learning," Robotics: Science and Systems. (RSS), 2019.