Learned Point Cloud Compression for Classification

Mateen Ulhaq and Ivan V. Bajić

MMSP 2023 Poitiers, France





https://github.com/multimedialabsfu/learned-point-cloud-compression-for-classification



Learned compression

- Ballé *et al.* proposed a "factorized prior" entropy model where each channel of the quantized latent \hat{y} is encoded using a channel-specific distribution.
- Rate is $R = -\log_2 p_{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{y}})$.
- Distortion is $D(\boldsymbol{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{x}})$ between the input \boldsymbol{x} and reconstructed input $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$.
- Loss is $\mathcal{L} = R + \lambda \cdot D(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\hat{x}})$ where λ is a trade-off hyperparameter.



Codec architectures



Fig. 1. High-level comparison of codec architectures.

Input data formats

<u>P × 3 matrix</u>

 $\begin{bmatrix} (x_1, y_1, z_1), \\ (x_2, y_2, z_2), \\ \dots \\ (x_{\Box}, y_{\Box}, z_{\Box}) \end{bmatrix}$



Point list PointNet, PointNet++

Very light MLP-based architectures. No worthwhile canonical ordering of points. Challenges: order-invariance, finding 3d metric structure aware operations.

Voxel grid VoxNet, 3D ShapeNet, 3D conv-based models

 $O(n^3)$ memory. Limits resolution: $1024 \times 1024 \times 1024 \Rightarrow 4$ GB per float32 tensor! 3D convs are computationally heavy. Empty space \Rightarrow wasted computation.



Octree OctNet, VoxelContextNet, OctAttention, octree context modeling

More "compact" than voxels. Large region of empty space represented by a single "0" node.

PointNet



input permutation-invariant function f

$$f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)=(\gamma\circ\pi)(h(x_1),\ldots,h(x_n))$$

Architecture Multiply by reparameterized gain vector for faster convergence, where $\alpha = 10$. EncoderBlock EncoderBlock EncoderBlock EncoderBlock EncoderBlock $N \times P$ NN3 imes PNPool Entropy ~ MLP xyY model axis=2 $\blacktriangleright R$ αv NTABLE I EncoderBlock LAYER SIZES AND MAC COUNTS FOR VARIOUS PROPOSED CODEC TYPES Proposed Encoder Decoder Encoder Decoder Conv1d; k = 1codec layer sizes layer sizes MAC/pt MAC BatchNorm1d 64 64 64 128 1024 full 512 256 40 150k 670k lite 8 8 16 16/2 32/4 512 256 40 0.47k 160k ReLU micro 16 512 256 40 0.048k 150k

*Format: "out channels/groups"

Experimental setup

- Dataset: sampled point clouds from ModelNet40 object meshes.
- Loss: $\mathcal{L} = R + \lambda \cdot D(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{\hat{t}})$



ModelNet40 object meshes (before sampling).

Trained separate models for various tuples (λ , *P*, Architecture):

- Varying R-D tradeoff $\lambda \in [10, 16000]$
- Number of input points $P \in \mathcal{P} = \{8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024\}$
- "full", "lite", "micro" architecture sizes

PointNet missing data ratio

The PointNet paper indicates that a model trained on P = 1024 points degrades in accuracy as the number of points P' in the input point cloud decreases.

To avoid this, we trained models specialized for each P' of randomly-sampled input points, so that P = P'. We measured a sizeable improvement by doing so.

(e.g., inputting a P' = 64 point cloud into a P = 1024 trained model results in a 65% reduction in accuracy; whereas, inputting a P' = 64 point cloud into a P = 64 trained model results in a 3% reduction in accuracy.)



Results: rate-accuracy curves



(a) "full" codec

(b) "lite" codec

Results: rate-accuracy curves



(c) "micro" codec

(d) input compression codecs

		Codec	Max acc (%)	BD rate (rel %)	BD acc (%)
		Input compression			
		TMC13 [25]	88.5	0.0	0.0
		OctAttention [12]	88.4	-13.2	+2.1
		IPDAE [13]	87.0	-23.0	+3.6
		Draco [26]	88.3	+780.7	-4.2
	ſ	Proposed (full)			
Fncoder		P = 1024	88.5	-93.8	+16.4
		P = 512	88.0	-93.7	+15.9
150 kMAC/pt	J	P = 256	87.6	-93.3	+15.4
	1	P = 128	87.1	-92.7	+14.9
Decoder:		P = 64	86.1	-91.1	+13.2
670 kMAC		P = 32	81.8	-90.6	+9.3
070144110		P = 16	70.4	-86.8	-2.3
	C	P = 8	46.8	-88.5	-25.3
	ſ	Proposed (lite)			
Fncoder		P = 1024	85.0	-93.0	+13.5
		P = 512	85.5	-92.8	+14.2
0.47 KMAC/pt	J	P = 256	84.4	-92.4	+12.8
- 1	1	P = 128	84.0	-91.6	+12.5
Decoder:		P = 64	81.3	-88.5	+9.8
160 kMAC		P = 32	76.3	-88.7	+4.9
		P = 16	66.2	-86.1	-4.1
	C	P = 8	43.6	-90.2	-28.0
	ſ	Proposed (micro)			
Fncoder		P = 1024	83.6	-91.8	+12.7
		P = 512	82.5	-91.6	+11.6
0.048 KMAC/pt	J	P = 256	81.6	-91.1	+11.0
- 1	1	P = 128	80.1	-90.9	+9.9
Decoder:		P = 64	76.6	-89.9	+6.5
150 kMAC		P = 32	70.3	-89.0	+0.1
200 100000		P = 16	59.4	-87.6	-10.8
	L	P = 8	41.9	-88.3	-28.8

Results

 TABLE II

 BD metrics and max attainable accuracies per codec

P is the number of points in the input \boldsymbol{x} . The BD metrics were computed using the TMC13 input compression codec as the reference anchor.

Reconstruction network (for visualization only)

We trained an auxiliary reconstruction network on the loss $\mathcal{L} = D(\boldsymbol{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{x}})$, where D is Chamfer distance. Note that these gradients are not propagated to \hat{y} .



Critical point set

For a specific codec, the **critical point set** is a minimal subset of the input point cloud that generates the exact same compressed bitstream as the input point cloud.



Critical point set (formally)

Definition. For any given point cloud \boldsymbol{x} , let $\boldsymbol{x}_C \subseteq \boldsymbol{x}$ denote a *critical point set*. Then, $g_a(\boldsymbol{x}_C) = g_a(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{y}$, and there is uniquely one valid critical point set $(\boldsymbol{x}_C)_C$ for \boldsymbol{x}_C , and it is itself.

A critical point set may be computed by

$$oldsymbol{x}_C = igcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} rgmax_{oldsymbol{x}_i \in oldsymbol{x}} (h(oldsymbol{x}_i))_j,$$

where $\{h(\boldsymbol{x}_i) : 1 \leq i \leq P\}$ represents the entire set of generated latent vectors immediately preceding max pooling.

Reconstructions

Our codecs achieve 80% accuracy at:

Codec	Rate
full	30 bits
lite	40 bits
micro	50 bits

100% accuracy lower bound on rate for 40 balanced classes:

 $\log_2(40)pprox 5.3 ext{ bits}$

Recall: h(x) is applied to each point independently. No information mixing, except for the max pooling operation!

Contrast with traditional MLP classifier that mixes information to achieve low rate.



Fig. 4. Reconstructions of a sample airplane 3D model from the Model-Net40 test set for various codecs and bitrates. For each reconstruction, its corresponding reference point cloud is marked with *critical points* in red.

Discussion

$$H(oldsymbol{x}) = I(oldsymbol{x};oldsymbol{x}) \geq I(oldsymbol{x};oldsymbol{\hat{y}}) = H(oldsymbol{\hat{y}}) - H(oldsymbol{\hat{y}} \mid oldsymbol{x}) = H(oldsymbol{\hat{y}})$$

Thus, on average, \hat{y} must be at least as compressible as x.

In fact, since \hat{y} is the same when generated from the critical point set $x_C \subseteq x$, $H(x) \ge H(x_C) \ge H(\hat{y})$.

Furthermore, $|\boldsymbol{x}_C| \leq N$ = 16 and 32 for the "lite" and "micro" codecs. Their $H(\hat{\boldsymbol{y}})$ is upper bounded by the entropy of the critical points.

This explains why the rate is so low. (But surprisingly, the accuracy is still good!)

Conclusion

- New codec for point cloud classification.
- Our "full" codec achieves great rate-accuracy performance vs "traditional" methods.
- Our "lite" and "micro" codecs achieve comparable gains in rate-accuracy performance, while consuming minimal edge-side computational resources.
- Helps progress towards achieving more capable end devices.

Future work:

- Other point cloud tasks (e.g. segmentation, object detection).
- Complex tasks involving larger models and point clouds from real-world datasets.
- Scalable and multi-task point cloud compression.

Thank you

Q&A prediction

Q: How was sampling done?

A: Uniformly sampled point cloud from object meshes (surfaces), then randomly subsampled that for smaller clouds. (Or was it *all* uniform sampling? I should check...)

Q: Why not farthest point sampling? A: Uniform sampling almost models a true Gaussian. And random subsampling = zero computation.

Q: Why the gain vector?

A: Better training stability, and allows network to zero out channels more easily, IIRC. (Even though conv1d is has equivalent representational capabilities.)

Q: Why multiply by 10 before the entropy bottleneck? A: Much faster convergence since it now operates in range [-10, 10] instead of [-1, 1], which disappears under quantization pretty easily. Q: Isn't ModelNet40 too easy a dataset? A: Perhaps, but this was a first work in point cloud compression + classification.

Q: But if N=16... is the theoretical analysis not obvious?! N=16 tensor elements would certainly have small rate... A: Mathematically, nothing inhibits an element from being uniformly distributed along a domain of $[0, 2^{100000}]$. Well, hardware floating point does, I guess. But a more *mathematically* rigorous upper bound argument is that the number of *critical points* \leq N, as presented.

Q: ... A: ... Q: ...

A: ...

Overview

- Motivation
- Preliminaries / Related works
- Architecture
- Experimental setup
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Discussion

For input point clouds containing P = 1024 points, our "full", "lite", and "micro" codec configurations achieve an accuracy of 80\% with as few as 30, 40, and 50 bits.

For comparison, \$\log_2(40) \approx 5.3 \text{ bits}\$ are required to losslessly encode uniformly distributed class labels of the 40 classes from ModelNet40.

Our codec comes surprisingly close to this theoretical lower bound, despite the fact that our architecture design omits the traditional MLP "classifier" within the encoder.

The same pointwise function is applied to all points, and the only operation that "mixes" information between the points is a pooling operation.



ModelNet40 object meshes (before sampling).

$$\min_{p(\boldsymbol{\hat{y}}|\boldsymbol{x})} \quad I(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\hat{y}}) - eta \cdot I(\boldsymbol{\hat{y}}; \boldsymbol{\hat{t}})$$

 $\min_{p(\boldsymbol{\hat{y}}|\boldsymbol{x})} \quad H(\boldsymbol{\hat{y}}) + \lambda \cdot D(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{\hat{t}})$

 $\mathcal{L} = R + \lambda \cdot D(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{\hat{t}})$







Motivation

Methods:

- Edge-only: limited computational ability
- Cloud-only: limited by available bitrate
- Shared: balance of both





Input data formats

- Raw point lists [(x1, y1, z1), (x2, y2, z2), ..., (xn, yn, zn)]
 PointNet, PointNet++, etc
- Voxels
 - 3D ShapeNet, various convolutional models, etc



- Octrees
 - VoxelContextNet, OctAttention, octree context modelling approaches, etc







Rate-accuracy curves



Fig. 3. Rate-accuracy curves evaluated on the ModelNet40 test set.

PointNet

Classification Network mlp (64,128,1024) input mlp (64,64) feature max mlp transform input points transform (512,256,k)pool 1024 nx64 nx64 nx3 nx3 nx1024 shared shared global feature output scores point features output scores 64x64 3x3 T-Net T-Net transform transform nx128 nxm n x 1088 shared shared matrix matrix multiply multiply mlp (512,256,128) mlp (128,m) Segmentation Network

Figure 2. PointNet Architecture. The classification network takes n points as input, applies input and feature transformations, and then aggregates point features by max pooling. The output is classification scores for k classes. The segmentation network is an extension to the classification net. It concatenates global and local features and outputs per point scores. "mlp" stands for multi-layer perceptron, numbers in bracket are layer sizes. Batchnorm is used for all layers with ReLU. Dropout layers are used for the last mlp in classification net.

Note: "Shared-MLP" = 1x1 conv i.e. every point is independently and identically processed by the same function f(p)

PointNet



PointNet



PointNet

Classification Network



PointNet with split before the fully-connected classifier



PointNet with split before the fully-connected classifier



Takeaways

- Point-based models are often significantly more computationally lighter than comparable convolutional models.
- PointNet-style models do very well on sparse inputs, unlike "conv" models.
- The amount of points/bits needed for classification on ModelNet is quite low.
- Unlike image data (?), only a small subsample of the original input data is necessary for reasonable classification performance.



Semi-editable Non-editable Fditable Editable Fditable Medium-fast Medium Very slow Fast Live preview (but no source-only mode :(L)ve preview (but no source-only mode :() No live preview Live preview Semi-live preview Poor UX Medium UX Medium UX Good UX Medium UX Single resolution Resolution adjustable Resolution adjustable Resolution adjustable Good default resolution Good default resolution Poor default resolution High default resolution Transparent background Transparent background Transparent background Transparent background Display mode / inline mode Inline mode only Display mode / inline mode Display mode / inline mode Single color Single color No colors Colors (paid version) No colors Handwriting OCR input

 $rac{1}{n^2} \; \sum_{n=1}^\infty rac{1 \, \pi^2}{n^2 \, 6} rac{\pi^2}{6}$

Equation Editor ++

Hypatia Create

Auto-LaTeX Equations

n=

Better Math Equations

MathType (paid, 30 day free trial)

Medium-slow Single resolution High default resolution Transparent background N/A - not LaTeX based No LaTeX input

Autograd topics

- Review backprop 3B1B visual
- Colah and pytorch viz computational graphs <u>https://pytorch.org/blog/overview-of-pytorch-autograd-engine/</u>; leaf nodes, requires_grad, detach, etc
- derivatives yaml
- Using .detach() tricks [easy, slower perf] and autograd.function [more work] comparison between different situations (e.g. STE, and my particular situation)
- Jacobian jvp, etc? Ehhh maybe out-of-scope? idk...
- Review: Entropy Bottleneck in-depth, discrete CDFs, etc
- RDOQ, etc