# Discrete-Constrained Regression for Local Counting Models —Supplementary Materials

Haipeng Xiong<sup>[0000-0002-8858-3807]</sup> and Angela Yao<sup>[0000-0001-7418-6141]</sup>

National University of Singapore, Singapore {haipeng,ayao}@comp.nus.edu.sg

## 1 Architecture of Local Count Networks

For our local count models, we adopted all the convolutional layers in VGG16 [2] to extract feature maps, then we used a regression head consisting of two  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layers (512 and 1 output channels, respectively) to map local features to local counts, as shown in Fig. 1. The size of the local patch is  $32 \times 32$ .



Fig. 1. Architecture of local count models. "VGG16" denotes all of the convolutional layers in VGG16 [2], "regressor" is consisted of two  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layers with 512 and 1 output channels, respectively. In this example, H = W = 128 and  $H_c = W_c = 4$ .

### 2 Additional Experiment on Real-World Datasets

#### 2.1 Analysis of Global Count Loss $L_{\rm gc}$

Fig. 2 presents an example of error matrix E of local count,  $S^a$  and  $S^m$ . Since the error of the image is 3.8 (> 0),  $S^a$  selects the the local image patches with E(j,k) > 0.  $S^m$  further selects the patches with error 1.50 and 2.3, the sum of which is equal to the global error 3.8.

2 Xiong et al.

Ε			S <sup>a</sup>			$S^m$		
-0.10	-0.10	-0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
-0.10	0.10	0.20	0	1	1	0	0	0
0.10	1.50	2.30	1	1	1	0	1	1

**Fig. 2.** An example of  $S_i^a$  of  $L_{\text{bias}}^0$  and  $S_i^m$  of  $L_{\text{bias}}^\lambda$ . *E* denotes the error of local counts.



**Fig. 3.** Visualization of  $S^a$  of  $L^0_{\text{bias}}$  (left) and  $S^m$  of  $L^{\lambda}_{\text{bias}}$  (right) during training. S = 0/1 denotes the sample with prediction inside/outside the interval range.  $S^m = k | S = j$  denotes the proportion of samples among S = j which satisfies  $S^m = k$ .

We further compare  $S^a$ ,  $S^m$  during the training phase in Fig. 3. At the beginning of training phase,  $L_{\text{bias}}^0$  considers nearly half of the local counts  $C_i^{pre}$  within the class intervals, which harms the discrete constraints; while  $L_{\text{bias}}^{\lambda}$  considers a small portion of the samples predicted within the class intervals, which mainly contribute to the error of global counts. In this way,  $L_{\text{bias}}^{\lambda}$  does not harm the discrete regression loss  $L_{dc}$  during training, and is helpful to reduce discretization error when most samples are predicted within class intervals at late epochs.

#### **3** DC-regression With Various Backbones

In the paper, we adopt VGG16 [2] as backbone for dc-regression for fair comparison with other methods. Here we evaluate dc-regression with more backbones, including SWIN [1] and efficient network [4].

Table 1. Comparison Different Network Backbone on JHU dataset [3].

Backbone	MAE	MSE
VGG16 [2]	64.8	282.6
SWIN-T $[1]$	62.2	242.2
SWIN-L [1]	61.5	259.1
effnet-b 4 $\left[4\right]$	65.5	251.1

## References

- Liu, Z., Lin, Y., Cao, Y., Hu, H., Wei, Y., Zhang, Z., Lin, S., Guo, B.: Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 10012–10022 (2021)
- 2. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. Computer Science (2014)
- 3. Sindagi, V.A., Yasarla, R., Patel, V.M.: Jhu-crowd++: Large-scale crowd counting dataset and a benchmark method. Technical Report (2020)
- Tan, M., Le, Q.: Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 6105–6114. PMLR (2019)