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## Motivation



- Exercise, sleep and nutrition monitoring is essential for optimizing athletic performance
- Need to reduce friction (manual, inaccurate) to make nutrition monitoring fast and easy
- Visual food recognition greatly simplifies logging of meals using context and content
- Provides accurate tracking of diet and planning nutritional intake for achieving goals
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## System Architecture and Interface

Snap Meal Photos


Client side

## Demo
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## Image Recognition



## DATA

## - Food vs Not-Food Dataset

- Food
- IBM food images
- Tastespotting.com
- Food.com
- Food 101
- Not-Food
- IBM non-food images
- NUS Wide
- SUN
- ImageCLEF medical
- Flickr images
- Training set 2.6 M images
- Test set 660K images
- 43\% Food, 57\% Not-Food


## MODEL

- Fine-tuned Binary GoogleNet
- Converged pretty fast
- Picked model at 7 K iteration
- base_Ir: 0.001 - max_iter: 10000000
- Ir_policy: "step" •momentum: 0.9
- stepsize: 320000
- weight_decay: 0.0002
- gamma: 0.96



## Food Filtering - Experiments

Food vs NotFood classifier ROC curve on Test set


- UNI-CT Dataset http://iplab.dmi.unict.it/UNICT-FD889/
- 3,583 Positive images of 889 foods (taken in restaurants with mobile)
- 4,804 Positive food images (from Flickr)
- 8,005 Negative images (from Flickr)
- 2 evaluation settings:
- Food889 (positive) vs No-Food (Negative Flickr)
- Food (positive Flickr) vs No-Food (Negative Flickr)
- Baseline: one class SVM from Farinella et al. [14]

Food vs NotFood classifier ROC curve on UNI-CT test


| Method | One-Class SVM [14] | Binary Ensemble SVM | Binary Fine-Tuned GoogleNet |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food889 True Positives Rate | 0.6543 | 0.8685 | 0.9711 |
| Flickr Food True Positives Rate | 0.4300 | 0.6744 | 0.9417 |
| Flickr No-Food True Negative Rate | 0.9444 | 0.9589 | 0.9817 |
| Overall Accuracy | 0.9202 | 0.9513 | 0.9808 |

[14] G. M. Farinella, D. Allegra, F. Stanco, and S. Battiato. On the exploitation of one class classification to distinguish food vs non-food images. In New Trends in Image Analysis and Processing ICIAP MaDiMa Workshop, 2015.

- In 2010, 85k different products were identified in US food chains ${ }^{1}$
- Most nutrition databases glean data from USDA, manufacturers and restaurant chains. Commercial database sizes range from 10 k to 700k, but size is deceptive and too many options make logging food almost impossible
- Some databases are NOT curated (they include duplicates, unverified user entries, multiple entries per different portions of the same item, etc.). Most scientific, curated, comprehensive databases have 50k-80k entries
- Nutritionix ${ }^{2}$ is the largest curated database, with 620 k entries ('Spaghetti Marinara’ produces over 3000 matches!)


## Approx size (US) Sample sources of data



1. Weng Ng, Popkin: "Monitoring foods and nutrients sold and consumed in the United States: Dynamics and Challenges", http://www.ncbi.nIm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3289966/
2. https://www.nutritionix.com/

## Food in

 the wild- Food-101 [7]
- 101 classes
- 1,000 images per class
- Food 500 (ours)
- 508 classes
- 290 images per class
- 6-Chain (ours)
- ~ 50 classes / chain
- ~10 image / class
- Images from Applebee's, Denny's, Olive Garden, Panera Bread, and TGI Fridays

| Food in <br> context | 6-Chain (ours)  <br>  $\sim 50$ classes / chain <br> $\cdot$ $\sim 10$ image / class <br>  - Images from Applebee's, Denny's, Olive <br>  Garden, Panera Bread, and TGI Fridays |
| ---: | :--- |
|  |  |

- Random splits: $75 \%$ for training, $25 \%$ for testing
- Evaluation metric: Fine-grained classification accuracy


Food-101 Images


6-Chain Images

- Performance of Deep Learning Food Recognition Models on Restaurant Chains food
- Each Restaurant chain is evaluated independently

K-NN: based on fc7 features from AlexNet [26]
$\square$ AlexNet: finetuned on restaurant chain training set
$\square$ GoogLeNet [36] : finetuned on Restaurant chains training set, similar to im2calories [30]
$\square$ GoogLeNet $_{\text {Food }}$ : two finetuning steps, first n subset of Food vs Not-food dataset, then Restaurant chains training set

| Restaurant | \# Classes | \# Images | \# Images per class |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applebee's | 50 | 405 | 8 |
| Au Bon Pain | 43 | 146 | 3 |
| Denny's | 56 | 325 | 6 |
| Olive Garden | 55 | 457 | 8 |
| Panera Bread | 79 | 2,267 | 28 |
| TGI Fridays | 54 | 432 | 8 |

- Performance of Deep Learning Food Recognition Models on Restaurant Chains food
- Each Restaurant chain is evaluated independently

K-NN: based on fc7 features from AlexNet [26]
$\square$ AlexNet: finetuned on restaurant chain training set
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$\square$ GoogLeNet $_{\text {Food }}$ : two finetuning steps, first $n$ subset of Food vs Not-food dataset, then Restaurant chains training set

| Restaurant | \# Classes | \# Images | \# Images per class |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applebee's | 50 | 405 | 8 |
| Au Bon Pain | 43 | 146 | 3 |
| Denny's | 56 | 325 | 6 |
| Olive Garden | 55 | 457 | 8 |
| Panera Bread | 79 | 2,267 | 28 |
| TGI Fridays | 54 | 432 | 8 |

- Most recognition errors result from visually similar dish items in the same category
- E.g., even if the system fails to recognize the specific type of soup, it still recognizes that it is a soup
- Idea*: incorporate hierarchical taxonomic information in learning process


Item: triple bacon burger
Estimated: mushroom swiss burger Category: Burger


Item: strawberry fields salad Estimated: Yucatan Chicken Salad Category: Salad


Item: black bean soup Estimated: turkey chili Category: Soup


Item: sesame seed bagel Estimated: everything bagel

Category: Bagel


- Building a large-scale food image database
- Enables accurate food visual recognition and nutrition logging in real world settings

Web and Social Media
Crawling

"bacon"

Unnecessary images removal

- Duplicates shat en as
- Empty images
- Small images


Crowdsourced human verifications


Comparison to existing datasets

|  | Dataset | Number of Classes | Number of Images/Class | Number of Images | Food Ontology |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum$ | UEC Food 256 [22] | 256 | 89 | 31,651 | None |
| $\stackrel{\square}{1}$ | Geolocalized [40] | 3,852 | 30 | 117,504 | None |
| - | Food-101 [7] | 101 | 1000 | 101,100 | None |
| 2 | ETHZ Food 101 [37] | 101 | 1000 | 101,100 | None |
| $\sum$ | Food 500 | 508 | 290 | 148,408 | Yes |
| $\pm$ | Food 3,000 (ongoing) | 3000 | 500 | 1.5 M | Yes |

Model: GoogleNet pretrained on Imagenet and finetuned on given dataset

| Dataset | Accuracy (top 1) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Food 101 [Martinel ICCV15] | 79 |
| Food 101 (ours) | 69.64 |
| Food 500 (ours) | 40.37 |



## Worst Categories
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Creole rice
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# Conclusions 

## LESSONS LEARNED

- Created end-to-end food recognition API that can recognize pictures of food in restaurants and "in the wild"
- Tested state of the art on largest food image dataset with ${ }^{\sim} 150 \mathrm{~K}$ images of 500 food categories organized in a hierarchical taxonomy
- Context matters
- Amount and quality of training images matter


## FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- More data
- expand "wild" dataset to 1-3K categories and 1-2M images
- expand Restaurant chains dataset by adding more restaurants
- Food portion estimation "in the wild" will require food segmentation, depth and volume estimation
- Incorporate other types of context (diet history, meal time, local cuisine)


# Check out our related work! 

Hui Wu, Michele Merler, Rosario Uceda-Sosa, John Smith
Learning to Make Better Mistakes: Semantics-aware Visual Food Recognition ACM Multimedia Poster Session - Monday Oct 17 ${ }^{\text {th }} 14.00$ - 17.00

## Questions?



