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Abstract
Matrix factorization has been recently utilized for the task of multi-modal hashing for cross-modality visual search, where basis functions are learned to map data from different modalities to the same Hamming embedding. In this paper, we propose a novel cross-modality hashing algorithm termed Supervised Matrix Factorization Hashing (SMFH) which tackles the multi-modal hashing problem with a collective non-negative matrix factorization across the different modalities. In particular, SMFH employs a well-designed binary code learning algorithm to preserve the similarities among multi-modal original features through a graph regularizarion. At the same time, semantic labels, when available, are incorporated into the learning procedure. We conjecture that all these would facilitate to preserve the most relevant information during the binary quantization process, and hence improve the retrieval accuracy. We demonstrate the superior performance of SMFH on three cross-modality visual search benchmarks, i.e., the PASCAL-Sentence, Wiki, and NUS-WIDE, with quantitative comparison to various state-of-the-art methods [Kumar and Udupa, 2011; Rastegari et al., 2013; Zhang and Li, 2014; Ding et al., 2014].

1 Introduction
Cross-modality retrieval has been a fundamental problem in several emerging applications including visual search, machine translation, and text mining [Bronstein et al., 2010; Masci et al., 2014; Rasiwasia et al., 2010; Costa Pereira et al., 2014]. In a typical scenario of cross-modality retrieval, a query comes from one modality, e.g., text, while the returned results come from another modality, e.g., image. To achieve this goal, a typical solution adopted by most existing works is to embed data samples of different modalities into a common low-dimensional space. By doing so, both the query and returns can be well aligned to capture their cross-modality similarities for retrieval [Costa Pereira et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014].

Recently, both unsupervised and supervised hashing techniques have been investigated for cross-modality retrieval due to their prominent efficiency. For instance, Bronstein et al. proposed a Cross-Modality Similarity Search Hashing (CMSSH) algorithm by using eigen-decomposition and boosting. Both Cross-View Hashing (CVH) [Kumar and Udupa, 2011] and Inter-Media Hashing (IMH) [Song et al., 2013] extended the classic Spectral Hashing approach [Weiss et al., 2009] to the scenario of cross-modality retrieval. For another instance, Co-Regularized Hashing (CRH) [Zhen and Yeung, 2012] and Heterogeneous Translated Hashing (HTH) [Wei et al., 2014] further deal with the cross-modality hashing under a co-regularized boosting framework.

In [Rastegari et al., 2013], Predictable Dual-View Hashing (PDH) was proposed to learn the discriminative hash functions via a max-margin formulation with an iterative optimization algorithm. In [Ding et al., 2014], Collective Matrix Factorization Hashing (CMFH) was proposed to formulate the joint learning of cross-modality binary codes as a collective matrix factorization problem. In [Zhang and Li, 2014], Supervised Multi-modal Hashing (SMH) was proposed to integrate semantic labels to improve the performance of hash function learning in the respective modalities.

While promising progress has been made, it remains an open problem to capture the multi-modal similarities among data samples, as well as to preserve such similarities in a produced binary code (Hamming) space. As mentioned before, collective factorization [Ding et al., 2014] and supervised hashing [Zhang and Li, 2014] have demonstrated outperformance on respective problems, a.k.a., for cross-modality retrieval and for single-modality binary code learning [Liu et al., 2015; Mukherjee et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2015]. The intuition of our work is to combine the merits of supervised hashing [Liu et al., 2012; Zhang and Li, 2014] over the state-of-the-art cross-modality retrieval schemes [Ding et al., 2014].

However, the integration of both approaches towards supervised cross-modality hashing is not an easy task. In one aspect, it is hard to optimize the discrete Hamming distances. In the other aspect, the complexity of the existing matrix factorization hashing and supervised cross-modality hashing are very high, which are the square of the training set size [Zhang and Li, 2014; Liu et al., 2015; Mukherjee et al., 2015] and cannot be easily scaled up to massive training data.

In this paper, we propose a novel cross-modality hashing...
method, dubbed the name Supervised Matrix Factorization Hashing (SMFH), which addresses the above challenges under a graph-regularized, collective non-negative matrix factorization framework. The first contribution we make is a hybrid regularization method to model the hash function learning, which integrates graph regularization into the collective non-negative matrix factorization. The second contribution we make is a supervised collective non-negative matrix factorization scheme, which leverages semantic labels to refine the graph regularizer during the step of graph construction. It ensures the learned binary codes to preserve the semantic similarities among data within multiple modalities.

Besides the two contributions mentioned above, we also propose an optimization algorithm to solve the objective function designed for SMFH, which works under an iterative updating procedure with stochastic sampling. This strategy can reach a training time reduction of supervised cross-modality hashing. Fig. 1 shows the overall framework of the proposed SMFH scheme. We conduct extensive experiments in cross-modality visual search, i.e., using text queries to retrieve relevant images and vice versa, on three widely used benchmarks including, PASCAL-Sentence, Wiki and NUS-WIDE. We demonstrate the superior performance of SMFH over a group of state-of-the-art cross-modality hashing methods including CVH [Kumar and Udupa, 2011], PDH [Rastegari et al., 2013], SMH [Zhang and Li, 2014], and CMFH [Ding et al., 2014].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we present our SMFH approach in depth. Section 3 shows extensive experiments conducted on three benchmark datasets. Finally, we draw our conclusions in Section 4 and discuss the future work.

2 Supervised Matrix Factorization Hashing

In this section, we describe the proposed supervised cross-modality hashing algorithm. Without loss of generality, we take bi-modal hashing for instance, which can be easily extended to the scenario of multi-modality hashing.

2.1 Collective Factorization for Cross-Modality Hashing

Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) is a matrix decomposition algorithm that focuses on learning low-rank representation. We define a non-negative data matrix $X = [x_1, ..., x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$, where $N$ is the number of samples, $d$ is the feature dimension, and $x_i$ is the $i$-th sample. Non-negative matrix factorization aims at finding two non-negative factors $U = [u_1, ..., u_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $Y = [v_1, ..., v_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$, $r << d$, whose product can approximate $X$, i.e.,

$$X \approx UY.$$  (1)

The squared Frobenius norm of the difference between two matrices is commonly used as the cost function to measure the approximation quality [Cai et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2013], which is defined as:

$$\min_{U, Y} \|X - UY\|^2_F, \text{ s.t. } U \succeq 0, Y \succeq 0,$$  (2)

where $\| \cdot \|_F$ is the Frobenius norm of the matrix.

However, when facing cross-modality data, it is expected that the matrix $Y$ is a new multi-modality representation of the data matrices $X^1$ and $X^2$ in a common low-dimensional space. It aims to learn two base $U^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^1 \times r}$ and $U^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times r}$ to produce hash codes, which map bi-modal feature matrices into a $r$-dimensional binary code matrix $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times N}$, where $r$ is the number of hash bits. Ideally, $Y$ should reveal the hidden semantics shared by different modalities. Correspondingly, the learning of the hash code is done via:

$$\min_{Y, U^1, U^2} \sum_{t=1}^2 \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|^2_F,$$  (3)

where $\lambda_t$ is the weight coefficient of this modality satisfying $\sum_{t=1}^2 \lambda_t = 1$. Intuitively, for the 1-st modal data $X^1$, the matrix $U^1$ and the matrix $Y$ are learned by Eq. (3), which is the same to $X^2$, $y_{ji} = 1$ means that the corresponding semantic representation $u^1_{ij}$ is related to data $X^1_j$ and vice versa.

2.2 Learning Supervised Hash Function

Towards learning supervised hash function, our goal is to preserve the semantic similarity among data points in the Hamming
space. That says, the hash functions should enforce labeled data pair \(l(e_i) = l(e_j)\) to have identical or similar binary codes, where \(e_i = (x_i^1, x_i^2)\) is the \(i\)-th data sample on both modalities from the training set, and function \(l(\cdot)\) returns the supervised labels of the data across different modalities.

Our task is to find a graph matrix that preserves the intrinsic geometric structure of the similarity from bi-modal data. To this end, we first construct an affinity graph to model the aforementioned semantic information. This is done by calculating the pairwise similarity via the inner product among the semantic labels.

More specifically, the similarity between the \(i\)-th data sample and the \(j\)-th data sample is defined as follow:
\[
A_{ij} = l(e_i)^T \cdot l(e_j).
\]

Without loss of generality, we define a matrix \(L_a \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times N}\), where each column of \(L_a\) is the label representation vector of each data sample, and each row represents each sample's category\(^1\). Subsequently, the similarity matrix can be presented as \(A = L_a^T L_a\).

Then, our goal can be formulated via a spectral graph learning problem from the label similarity matrix \(A\) as:
\[
m_{\text{Y}} \min \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \| Y_i - Y_j \|^2 A_{ij} = Tr(Y^TLY),
\]
where \(L\) is the Laplacian matrix for \(A\).

Given data in two modalities, \(a.k.a., \mathbf{X} = \{x_i^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d1} | i = 1, ..., N\}, \mathbf{X}^2 = \{x_i^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d2} | i = 1, ..., N\}\), and their pairwise semantic similarity \(A\), the goal of supervised hash function learning is to learn two basis matrices \(U^1\) and \(U^2\), together with the hash codes \(Y\) by the following objective function:
\[
\min_{Y, U^1, U^2} \sum_{t=1}^{2} \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|_F^2 + \alpha Tr(Y^TLY),
\]
where \(\alpha\) is a balance parameter, which can be seen as a regularizer for the above collective non-linear factorization.

Intuitively, we learn coefficients of the optimal projection \(W^t\) by minimizing the error term between the linear hash function \(H^t(X^t) = \text{sgn}(W^t X^t)\) and the hash codes \(Y\) as \(\| \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{H}^t(\mathbf{X}^t) \|^2\). Inspired by [He et al., 2015], label graph can be used as Laplacian Regularized in this error. Then, the objective function of hash function learning is written as follows:
\[
\min_{H^t(\mathbf{X}^t)} \left\| \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{H}^t(\mathbf{X}^t) \right\|^2 + \eta Tr(H^t(X^t)LH^t(X^t)^T),
\]
where \(\eta\) is the balance parameter. This term is integrated with the term of supervised semantic similarity in the proposed graph-regularized collective matrix factorization. Then, the overall objective function is written as follows:
\[
\min_{Y, W} \sum_{t=1}^{2} \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|_F^2 + \alpha Tr(Y^TLY) + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} \left\{ \| \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{H}^t(\mathbf{X}^t) \|^2 + \eta Tr(H^t(X^t)LH^t(X^t)^T) \right\}
\]
s.t. \(Y \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times N}, \mathbf{Y}^T = \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{U}^t \geq 0,
\]
where \(\mu\) is a tradeoff parameter to control the weights between the hash function approximation and the proposed graph-regularized collective non-matrix factorization scheme.

\(^1\)In this paper, we assume that \(L_a\) is fully observed without missing labels. We can get the labels among points in many cases for missing labeled data, i.e., classification technology, which makes our assumption reasonable.

2.3 Optimization

Directly minimizing the objective function in Eq. (8) is intractable due to the discrete constraint of \(Y\). To tackle this issue, we relax the discrete constraint from \(Y \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times N}\) to \(0 \leq Y \leq 1\). After that, it is still non-convex with respect to \(Y, U^1, \) and \(W^t\) jointly. This is further handled by using an alternating optimization, i.e., updating one variable while fixing the rest two until convergence. Due to the scale of the label similarity matrix, it is inefficient to store and compute it during optimization. To solve this problem, we propose a random sampling method, which uses a sampled sub-graph to replace the complete similarity matrix. The detailed optimization procedure is presented as follows:

(1) Fix \(W^t\) and \(Y\), then update \(U^t\). The corresponding sub-problem is
\[
\min_{U^t} \sum_{t=1}^{2} \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|_F^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad U^t \geq 0, \|U^t\|_F \leq \|\lambda\|_1 = 1.
\]

Here we learn two basis matrices \(U^1\) and \(U^2\), which turns this sub-problem to be a traditional NMF problem for each modality.

By directly optimizing Eq. (9) within each modality respectively, we solve the new objective function through Lagrange multiplier \(\Psi = [\nu_{ik}]\) with constant \(\nu_{ij} \geq 0\):
\[
O_t(U^t) = Tr((X^t X^t)^T) - 2Tr(X^t Y^T U^T) + Tr(Y^T U^T) + Tr(\Psi U^T).
\]

We derive the partial derivatives with respect to \(U^t\) as:
\[
\frac{\partial O_t}{\partial U^t} = -2X^t Y^T + 2U^t Y Y^T + \Psi.
\]

Then by Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, we update \(U^t\) via the following procedure:
\[
u_{ij} \leftarrow \frac{(X^t Y^T)_{ij}}{(U^t Y Y^T)_{ij}}.
\]

Intuitively, \(U^t\) is non-negative after updating.

(2) Fix \(U^t\) and \(W^t\), then update \(Y\). We then fix \(U^t\) and \(W^t\), the updating of \(Y\) subsequently refers to:
\[
\min_Y \sum_{t=1}^{2} \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|_F^2 + \alpha Tr(Y^TLY) + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} \left( \| Y - W^t X^t \|^2_F + \beta \|YY^T - I\|^2_F \right)
\]
s.t. \(0 \leq Y \leq 1\).

However, the scale of the semantic matrix is extremely large, which needs huge storage cost and makes the Eq. (12) hard to optimize during each iteration. To tackle this problem, we randomly sample parts of the original label similarity matrix \(A\), which can approximate the graph regularization. We define a sampling matrix \(S \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times N}\) during each iteration, where \(m\) is the number of sampling points with \(m << N\). Then the hash code of sampled data can be represented by \(Y = Y^T S \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times m}\), and the sampled label representation can be presented by \(L_a = L_a^T S \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times m}\). By using the above sampling, this sub-problem of Eq. (12) can be rewritten as:
\[
\min_Y \sum_{t=1}^{2} \lambda_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|_F^2 + \alpha Tr(Y^TLY) + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} \left( \| Y - W^t X^t \|^2_F + \beta \|YY^T - I\|^2_F \right)
\]
s.t. \(0 \leq Y \leq 1\).

where \(\hat{L}\) is the Laplacian matrix for \(\hat{A} = L_a^T L_a\).
Algorithm 1: Supervised Matrix Factorization Hashing

**Input:** Training data points in two modalities $X^1$ and $X^2$, the corresponding pairwise semantic similarity matrix $A$, the number of support samples $m$, and the number of hash bits $r$.

**Output:** The hash codes $Y$ for training data and the projection coefficient matrix $W^t$.

1: Initialize $W^t$, $U^t$ and $Y$ by random matrices, $t = 1, 2$.
2: repeat
3: Fixing $W^t$ and $Y$, update $U^t$ by Eq. (12);
4: Uniformly and randomly select $m$ sample pairs from training data.
5: Fixing $U^t$ and $W^t$, update $Y$ by Eq. (17);
6: Fixing $U^t$ and $Y$, update $W^t$ by Eq. (18);
7: until convergence

Since solving such a constraint is not convenient, we further relax it to $Y \geq 0$ and normalize $Y$ after factorization in each iteration. Let $\Phi$ be the Lagrange Multiplier for the new constraint. The Lagrange term could be written as follows:

$$
O_2(Y) = 2 \sum_{t=1}^{2} \alpha_t (Tr(X^tX^t^T) - 2Tr(X^tY^TY^T)) + Tr(U^tY^TY^TU^t) + \alpha_t Tr(YY^T) + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} \{Tr(Y^TY^T) - 2Tr(Y^TY^TU^t) + Tr(W^tX^tW^t^T) + \beta \{Tr(X^tX^t^T) + \gamma \|W^t\|^2 + \Phi = 0.
$$

Using the KKT conditions, we have:

$$
\frac{\partial O_2}{\partial Y} = 2 \sum_{t=1}^{2} \alpha_t (-U^tX^t + U^tY) + 2\alpha_t YY^T + 2\mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} (Y - W^tX^t) + 4\beta \{YY^T - Y\} + \Phi = 0.
$$

Eq. (14) can be solved by the following updating rule:

$$
y_{ij} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{2} \alpha_t U^t_{i} X^t + \alpha Y \hat{A} S^T + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} W^t_{i} X^t + 4\beta Y_{ij}}{\sum_{t=1}^{2} \alpha_t U^t_{i} Y + \alpha Y DS^T + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{2} Y + 4\beta Y (Y^TY)_{ij}}.
$$

(3) Fix $U^t$ and $Y$, then update $W^t$. This last sub-problem finds the best projection coefficient $W^t$ by minimizing Eq. (3) for the $t$-th modality as the Laplacian Regularized Least squares algorithm [He et al., 2015], resulting in a closed-form solution:

$$
W^t = (X^t X^{tT} + \eta (X^S S^T) L (S^T X^{tT}) + \gamma I)^{-1} X^T Y^T.
$$

We summarize the whole procedure of the proposed SMFH in Algorithm 1.

2.4 Extension to Multi-Modality Search

It is quite intuitive to extend SMFH in Eq. (8) from bi-modal to multiple modalities, that is:

$$
\min_{Y, W^t} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \alpha_t \|X^t - U^t Y\|^2_F + \alpha Tr(Y^T Y^T) + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{n} \|Y - H^t (X^t)\|^2_F + \eta Tr(H^t (X^t) L H^t (X^t)) s.t. Y \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times n}, U^t \geq 0,
$$

where $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \alpha_t = 1$. It is convenient to adopt Algorithm 1 to minimize the objective function in Eq. (8). An alternating optimization strategy can also be used here. In particular, the variable $U^t$ and $W^t$ can be directly got through Eq. (12) and Eq. (17), respectively. And finally, the variable $Y$ can be learned by the new formulation as follows:

$$
y_{ij} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \alpha_t U^t_{i} X^t + \alpha Y \hat{A} S^T + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{n} W^t_{i} X^t + 4\beta Y_{ij}}{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \alpha_t U^t_{i} Y + \alpha Y DS^T + \mu \sum_{t=1}^{n} Y + 4\beta Y (Y^TY)_{ij}}.
$$

3 Experiments

Quantitative experiments are conducted to validate the advantages of the proposed cross-modality hashing algorithm on three widely-used benchmark, i.e., PASCAL-Sentence, Wiki and NUS-WIDE.

The PASCAL-Sentence dataset contains 1,000 images that are divided into 20 categories. Each image is represented by a 269-dimensional visual feature extracted by a collections detectors. A 2,790-dimensional textual feature is extracted using the bag-of-words representation with WordNet [Farhadi et al., 2010]. For this dataset, 800 image-sentence pairs are randomly sampled as the training set and the remaining for query testing.

The Wiki dataset contains 2,866 documents, where the image-text pairs are fully annotated with 10 semantic categories. Each image is represented as a 128-dimensional bag-of-visual-words feature. Each document is represented as a 10-dimensional topical feature using Latent Dirichlet Allocation [Blei et al., 2003]. For the Wiki dataset, we randomly select 75% image-text pairs for training and the rest for query testing.

The NUS-WIDE dataset contains 269,648 images with 81 concept crawled from Flickr. We select 186,577 labeled image-text pairs according to the top 10 largest concepts as adopted in [Hu et

---

3http://vision.cs.uiuc.edu/pascal-sentences/  
4http://www.svcl.ucsd.edu/projects/crossmodal/  
5http://nms.comp.nus.edu.sg/research/NUSWIDE.htm
Table 1: The mAP and Precision Comparison Using Hamming Ranking on Two Benchmark with Different Hash Bits.

| Task | Methods   | Wiki mAP | Precision@100 | NUS-WIDE mAP | Precision@100 |
|------|-----------|----------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|      |           | 32       | 64            | 128          | 64            | 32           | 64            |
|      | CVH       | 0.2053   | 0.1872        | 0.2039       | 0.1504        | 0.1324       | 0.4480        | 0.4184        | 0.4012        | 0.4606        | 0.4281        |
|      | PDH       | 0.2034   | 0.2047        | 0.2133       | 0.1765        | 0.1725       | 0.5008        | 0.5078        | 0.5336        | 0.4885        | 0.5018        |
|      | CMFH      | 0.5947   | 0.6063        | 0.6131       | 0.5492        | 0.5649       | 0.3807        | 0.3787        | 0.3663        | 0.3764        | 0.3750        |
|      | SMH       | 0.3831   | 0.4032        | 0.4171       | 0.3135        | 0.3400       | 0.5978        | 0.6162        | 0.6195        | 0.6007        | 0.6194        |
| Task 1 | SMFH      | 0.6039   | 0.6602        | 0.6688       | 0.5581        | 0.6246       | 0.5462        | 0.6633        | 0.6247        | 0.5478        | 0.6757        |
|      | CVH       | 0.1660   | 0.1479        | 0.1572       | 0.1280        | 0.1170       | 0.4592        | 0.4260        | 0.4021        | 0.4700        | 0.4333        |
|      | PDH       | 0.2442   | 0.2360        | 0.2685       | 0.2058        | 0.1945       | 0.5129        | 0.5260        | 0.5377        | 0.4988        | 0.5224        |
|      | CMFH      | 0.2081   | 0.2111        | 0.2270       | 0.1691        | 0.1678       | 0.3818        | 0.3774        | 0.3664        | 0.3787        | 0.3766        |
|      | SMH       | 0.2301   | 0.2303        | 0.2570       | 0.1933        | 0.2186       | 0.5823        | 0.6020        | 0.6089        | 0.5829        | 0.6039        |
|      | SMFH      | 0.2516   | 0.2581        | 0.2496       | 0.2168        | 0.2350       | 0.5938        | 0.6325        | 0.6175        | 0.5985        | 0.6380        |

Quantitative Results: Fig. 2 shows the mAP results on PASCAL-Sentence dataset with different bits on both retrieval tasks. SMFH has achieved remarkable mAP scores, especially when hash bit is larger than 32. Comparing to the second best scheme, SMFH has achieved 7.1% mAP improvement for the Task 1 and 6.5% improvement for the Task 2.

Then, we evaluate the proposed method on Wiki, as shown in the first row of Fig. 3 and Tab. 1, which demonstrate that SMFH has achieved superior performance on this benchmark for both text-to-image and image-to-text sides, both with a performance gain of more than 6%. The mAP results and Precision@100 results on Wiki are reported in Tab. 1 under the setting of 32, 64, and 128 bits respectively. SMFH has achieved remarkable mAP and precision scores. Comparing with the state-of-the-art algorithms, i.e., [Kumar and Udupa, 2011; Rastegari et al., 2013; Zhang and Li, 2014; Ding et al., 2014], for the task of text-to-image retrieval, our SMFH has significant advantage on precision and mAP values with all bits, mainly due to the fact that the matrix factorization can successfully find better latent topic concepts from text. Meanwhile SMFH fully uses supervised label to improve the cross-modality retrieval. Fig. 3 shows the comparison of precision curves and recall curves on Wiki when hash bit is 64.

Similar performance gains are observed on the large-scale NUS-WIDE, especially in the text-to-image retrieval. As shown in Tab. 1 and the second row of Fig. 3, SMFH achieves highest search accuracy. When the hash bit is 64, the precision of the top-100 Hamming ranking is over 60% by SMFH, which is much better than the state-of-the-arts [Ding et al., 2014; Kumar and Udupa, 2011; Rastegari et al., 2013; Zhang and Li, 2014]. Although, the mAP is not the highest when hash bit is 32 for text-to-image sides, SMFH maintain its the competitive advantage on higher hash bits. Nevertheless, the performance of Task 2 is at the second place, which also have competitive performance for cross-modality retrieval.

Tab. 2 shows the results of training time comparing with different algorithms on different hash bits on three benchmarks, which contain the whole training set. PDH and CMFH are much higher than that of our proposed SMFH, with larger size of training data and higher feature dimensions. SMFH can get the better performance comparing with others, by fully use of the semantic information to enhance the performance with less training time.

We further study the influence of different sizes of the training set. As shown in Fig. 4 (a) for Wiki, mAP results are shown when hash bit is 64, in which we vary the size of sampling from 200 to 2,000. The performance of cross-modality retrieval consistently improve with analyzing the relation of the parameter $m$, and show the convergence result. The three regularization parameters $\gamma$, $\beta$, and $\eta$ are set to a small number 0.001 in all the experiments.

**Figure 2:** The mAP curves on PASCAL-Sentence.
the increasing of the sampling size for SMFH. Thus, we randomly choose about 100 image-tag pairs for each concept as the training set for convenience in optimization, which contain about 1,000 pairs during each iteration. At last, we validate the convergence according to the sampling during each iteration. As shown in Fig.4 (b), when the size of sampling pairs is 1,000, and the hash bit is 64, SMFH can quickly converge by using random sampling. The same conclusion holds on the NUS-WIDE dataset.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a novel hashing method termed Supervised Matrix Factorization Hashing (SMFH) for cross-modality visual search. We employ graph regularization to develop a collective matrix factorization based hashing framework, which can preserve the similarities among original features from different modalities into a produced Hamming space. Meanwhile, SMFH incorporates supervised label information to enhance the quantization quality of the learned binary codes. Furthermore, hashing and graph regularization are integrated into a unified framework by means of joint hash function learning. In this framework, the given supervised labels can be leveraged to construct a label matrix, leading to more discriminative hash codes. Extensive experiments conducted on PASCAL-Sentence, Wiki, and NUS-WIDE benchmarks demonstrated the superior performance of SMFH over several state-of-the-art cross-modality hashing methods [Ding et al., 2014; Kumar and Udupa, 2011; Rastegari et al., 2013; Zhang and Li, 2014]. In the future, we would investigate large-scale discrete optimization techniques for the proposed SMFH.
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