

Methodology

Benchmark pair-wise task affinity scoring techniques

- Computer Vision dataset composed of +700K images and 5 tasks from Taskonomy [2]
- 6 task affinity scoring techniques benchmarked:
- TD: Taxonomical distance [Zamir et al., CVPR '18]
- IAS: Input attribution similarity [Song et al., NIPS'19]
- RSA: Representation similarity analysis [Dwivedi et al., CVPR'19]
- GS: Gradient similarity [Zhao et al., ECCV'18]
- GT: Gradient transference [Fifty et al., NIPS'21]
- LI: Label injection [ours]

- 4 levels of evaluation for each scoring:
- Predictive power
- Partner tasks ranking
- Best partner task identification
- **Computational cost**

 \rightarrow Affinity scoring accuracy

 \rightarrow Affinity scoring cost

Results

Label injection (LI) is more indicative than other scores by being able to identify the best partner for a given target task

Task	Best partner	TD	IAS	RSA	LI	GS	GT
SemSeg	Normal	Normal (+50%)	Normal (+50%)	Depth (+18%)	Normal (+50%)	Depth (+18%)	Depth (+18%)
Keypts	Normal	Edges (+1%)	Edges (+1%)	Edges (+1%)	Normal (+30%)	Edges (+1%)	Edges (+1%)
Edges	Normal	Keypts (-9%)	Keypts (-9%)	Keypts (-9%)	Normal (+78%)	Keypts (-9%)	Keypts (-9%)
Depth	Normal	Normal (0%)	SemSeg (-1%)	Normal (0%)	Normal (0%)	Normal (0%)	SemSeg (-1%)
Normal	Edges	SemS./Depth (-3%)	SemSeg (+1%)	Depth (-6%)	Depth (-6%)	Depth (-6%)	Depth (-6%)

Evaluation level: best partner identification.



How to read: For the target task Keypts the actual best partner is Normal.

All scores but Label injection (LI) select Edges, leading to only +1% performance gain instead of +30% if Normal was chosen.

[1] Which tasks should be learned together in multi-task learning? [Standley et al., PMLR 2020]

[2] Taskonomy: Disentangling task transfer learning [Zamir et al., CVPR 2018]