

Learning High-Precision Bounding Box for Rotated Object Detection via Kullback-Leibler Divergence

Xue Yang - Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Virtual. 2021



Two design paradigms for rotated detectors

- Induction paradigm
- Deduction paradigm





Induction paradigm



1. For horizontal bounding box regression, the model mainly outputs four items for location and size: $t_x^p = \frac{x_p - x_a}{w_a}, t_y^p = \frac{y_p - y_a}{h_a}, t_w^p = \ln\left(\frac{w_p}{w_a}\right), t_h^p = \ln\left(\frac{h_p}{h_a}\right)$ to match the four targets from the ground truth $t_x^t = \frac{x_t - x_a}{w_a}, t_y^t = \frac{y_t - y_a}{h_a}, t_w^t = \ln\left(\frac{w_t}{w_a}\right), t_h^t = \ln\left(\frac{h_t}{h_a}\right)$

2. Extending the above horizontal case, existing rotation detection models also use regression loss which simply involves an extra angle parameter

$$t^p_ heta = f(heta_p - heta_a), t^t_ heta = f(heta_t - heta_a)$$

3. The overall regression loss for rotation detection is:

$$L_{reg} = l_n \text{-norm} \left(\Delta t_x, \Delta t_y, \Delta t_w, \Delta t_h, \Delta t_\theta \right)$$

where $\Delta t_x = t_x^p - t_x^t = \frac{\Delta x}{w_a}, \Delta t_y = t_y^p - t_y^t = \frac{\Delta y}{h_a}, \Delta t_w = t_w^p - t_w^t = \ln(w_p/w_t), \Delta t_h = t_h^p - t_h^t = \ln(h_p/h_t), \text{ and } \Delta t_\theta = t_\theta^p - t_\theta^t = \Delta \theta.$



Deduction paradigm

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} = & \mathbf{R} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}^{\top} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{w}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{h}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{w}{2} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{h}{2} \sin^2 \theta & \frac{w-h}{2} \cos \theta \sin \theta \\ \frac{w-h}{2} \cos \theta \sin \theta & \frac{w}{2} \sin^2 \theta + \frac{h}{2} \cos^2 \theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &\mathbf{m} = & (x, y)^{\top} \end{split}$$
Property 1:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(w, h, \theta) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(h, w, \theta - \frac{\pi}{2});$$
Property 2:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(w, h, \theta) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(w, h, \theta - \pi);$$
Property 3:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(w, h, \theta) \approx \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(w, h, \theta - \frac{\pi}{2}), \text{ if } w \approx h.$$





Wasserstein Distance

➤ General formula :

$$\mathbf{D}_w(\mathcal{N}_p,\mathcal{N}_t)^2 = \underbrace{\|oldsymbol{\mu}_p-oldsymbol{\mu}_t\|_2^2}_{ ext{center distance}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{Tr}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p+oldsymbol{\Sigma}_t-2(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p^{1/2}oldsymbol{\Sigma}_toldsymbol{\Sigma}_p^{1/2})^{1/2})}_{ ext{coupling terms about }h_p, \, w_p ext{ and } heta_p}$$

Horizontal special case:

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{D}^h_w(\mathcal{N}_p,\mathcal{N}_t)^2 &= \|oldsymbol{\mu}_p-oldsymbol{\mu}_t\|_2^2+\|oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p^{1/2}-oldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{1/2}\|_F^2 \ &= (x_p-x_t)^2+(y_p-y_t)^2+ig((w_p-w_t)^2+(h_p-h_t)^2ig)/4 \ &= l_2 ext{-norm}(\Delta x,\Delta y,\Delta w/2,\Delta h/2) \end{aligned}$$



Kullback-Leibler Divergence

➤ General formula :

Or

$$\mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_{p}||\mathcal{N}_{t}) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{p} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t})^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{p} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t})}_{\text{term about } x_{p} \text{ and } y_{p}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t}|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p}|}}_{\text{coupling terms about } h_{p}, w_{p} \text{ and } \theta_{p}} - 1$$
Or

$$\mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_{t}||\mathcal{N}_{p}) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{p} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t})^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{p} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t})}_{\text{chain coupling of all parameters}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p}|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t}|}}_{\text{chain coupling of all parameters}} - 1$$

Horizontal special case :

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{D}^h_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_p||\mathcal{N}_t) &= rac{1}{2} \left(rac{w_p^2}{w_t^2} + rac{h_p^2}{h_t^2} + rac{4\Delta^2 x}{w_t^2} + rac{4\Delta^2 y}{h_t^2} + \lnrac{w_t^2}{w_p^2} + \lnrac{h_t^2}{h_p^2} - 2
ight) \ &= 2l_2 ext{-norm}(\Delta t_x, \Delta t_y) + l_1 ext{-norm}(\ln\Delta t_w, \ln\Delta t_h) + rac{1}{2}l_2 ext{-norm}(rac{1}{\Delta t_w}, rac{1}{\Delta t_h}) - 1 \end{aligned}$$



1. Specific expressions of KLD's main three terms:

$$egin{aligned} egin{aligned} egin{aligne} egin{aligned} egin{aligned} egin{aligned} egin$$

$$\ln rac{|oldsymbol{\Sigma}_t|}{|oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p|} = \ln rac{h_t^2}{h_p^2} + \ln rac{w_t^2}{w_p^2}$$

where $\Delta x = x_p - x_t, \Delta y = y_p - y_t, \Delta heta = heta_p - heta_t$



2. Without loss of generality, we set $\theta_t = 0$, then:

$$rac{\partial f_{kl}(\mu_p)}{\partial \mu_p} = \left(rac{4}{w_t^2}\Delta x, rac{4}{h_t^2}\Delta y
ight)^ op$$

When $\theta_t \neq 0$, the gradient of the object offset (Δx and Δy) will be dynamically adjusted according to the θ_t for better optimization. In contrast, the gradient of the center point in GWD and L2-norm are:

$$rac{\partial f_w(\mu_p)}{\partial \mu_p} = (2\Delta x, 2\Delta y)^ op \qquad rac{\partial f_{L_2}(\mu_p)}{\partial \mu_p} = (rac{2}{w_a^2}\Delta x, rac{2}{h_a^2}\Delta y)^ op$$



3. For h_p and w_p , we have

$$rac{\partial f_{kl}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial \ln h_p} = rac{h_p^2}{h_t^2} \cos^2 \Delta heta + rac{h_p^2}{w_t^2} \sin^2 \Delta heta - 1, \quad rac{\partial f_{kl}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial \ln w_p} = rac{w_p^2}{w_t^2} \cos^2 \Delta heta + rac{w_p^2}{h_t^2} \sin^2 \Delta heta - 1$$

On the one hand, the optimization of the h_p and w_p is affected by the $\Delta\theta$. When $\Delta\theta = 0$:

$$rac{\partial f_{kl}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial \ln h_p} = rac{h_p^2}{h_t^2} - 1, rac{\partial f_{kl}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial \ln w_p} = rac{w_p^2}{w_t^2} - 1$$

which means that the smaller targeted height or width leads to heavier penalty on its matching loss. This is desirable, as smaller height or width needs higher matching precision.



4. For
$$heta$$
: $rac{\partial f_{kl}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial heta_p} = \left(rac{h_p^2 - w_p^2}{w_t^2} + rac{w_p^2 - h_p^2}{h_t^2}
ight)\sin 2\Delta heta$

On the other hand, the optimization of $\Delta \theta$ is also affected by h_p and w_p . When $h_p =$

$$egin{aligned} h_t \,, \;\; w_p &= w_t \colon & \quad & rac{\partial f_{kl}(oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p)}{\partial heta_p} = \left(rac{h_t^2}{w_t^2} + rac{w_t^2}{h_t^2} - 2
ight) \sin 2\Delta heta \geq \sin 2\Delta heta \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the larger the aspect ratio of the object, the model will pay more attention to the optimization of the angle. This is the main reason why the KLD-based model has a huge advantage in high-precision detection as a slight angle error would cause a serious accuracy drop for large aspect ratios objects.



L₂ loss

GWD



Scale Invariance Comparison



- \succ Obviously GWD and L₂-norm are not scale-invariant .
- For two known Gaussian distributions X_p ~ N_p(µ_p, Σ_p) X_t ~ N_t(µ_t, Σ_t) and a full-rank matrix M (|M| ≠ 0), we have :

$$\mathbf{X}_{p^{'}} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{X}_p \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{M}oldsymbol{\mu}_p, \mathbf{M}oldsymbol{\Sigma}_p\mathbf{M}^ op), \mathbf{X}_{t^{'}} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{X}_t \sim \mathcal{N}_t(\mathbf{M}oldsymbol{\mu}_t, \mathbf{M}oldsymbol{\Sigma}_t\mathbf{M}^ op)$$

 $\begin{aligned} & \succ \text{ We mark them as } \mathcal{N}_{p'} \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_{t'}, \text{ then their KLD is calculated as follows:} \\ & \mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_{p'}||\mathcal{N}_{t'}) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t)^\top \mathbf{M}^\top (\mathbf{M}^\top)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Tr} \left((\mathbf{M}^\top)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_p \mathbf{M}^\top \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\mathbf{M}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t||\mathbf{M}^\top|}{|\mathbf{M}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_p||\mathbf{M}^\top|} - 1 \\ & \quad = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Tr} \left(\mathbf{M}^\top (\mathbf{M}^\top)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{-1} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_p \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_p|} - 1 \\ & \quad = \mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_p||\mathcal{N}_l) \end{aligned}$

> Therefore, KLD is actually affine invariance. When $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{kI}$, the scale invariance of KLD has been proved.



Scale Invariance Comparison





> After conducting high-precision detection experiments on 3 data sets and 2

detectors, we found that KLD almost beats the other two loss functions.

Table 3: High-precision detection experiment under different regression loss. 'R', 'F' and 'G' indicate random rotation, flipping, and graying, respectively.

Method	Dataset	Data Aug.	Reg. Loss	Hmean ₅₀ /AP ₅₀	Hmean ₆₀ /AP ₆₀	Hmean75/AP75	Hmean ₈₅ /AP ₈₅	Hmean50:95/AP50:95
			Smooth L1	84.28	74.74	48.42	12.56	47.76
RetinaNet			GWD	85.56 (+1.28)	84.04 (+9.30)	60.31 (+11.89)	17.14 (+4.58)	52.89 (+5.13)
	UDSC2016	DIFIC	KLD	87.45 (+3.17)	86.72 (+11.98)	72.39 (+23.97)	27.68 (+15.12)	57.80 (+10.04)
	HK5C2010	R+r+G	Smooth L1	88.52	79.01	43.42	4.58	46.18
R ³ Det			GWD	89.43 (+0.91)	88.89 (+9.88)	65.88 (+22.46)	15.02 (+10.44)	56.07 (+9.89)
			KLD	89.97 (+1.45)	89.73 (+10.72)	77.38 (+33.96)	25.12 (+20.54)	61.40 (+15.22)
			Smooth L1	70.98	62.42	36.73	12.56	37.89
	MSRA-TD500	R+F+G	GWD	76.76 (+5.78)	68.58 (+6.16)	44.21 (+7.48)	17.75 (+5.19)	43.62 (+5.73)
			KLD	76.96 (+5.98)	70.08 (+7.66)	46.95 (+10.22)	19.59 (+7.03)	45.24 (+7.35)
			Smooth L1	69.78	64.15	36.97	8.71	37.73
RetinaNet		F	GWD	74.29 (+4.51)	68.34 (+4.19)	43.39 (+6.42)	10.50 (+1.79)	41.68 (+3.95)
			KLD	75.32 (+5.54)	69.94 (+5.79)	44.46 (+7.49)	10.70 (+1.99)	42.68 (+4.95)
			Smooth L1	74.83	69.46	42.02	11.59	41.98
		R+F	GWD	76.15 (+1.32)	71.26 (+1.80)	45.59 (+3.57)	11.65 (+0.06)	43.58 (+1.60)
	ICDA D2015		KLD	77.92 (+3.09)	72.77 (+3.31)	43.27 (+1.25)	11.09 (-0.50)	43.65 (+1.67)
	ICDAR2015		Smooth L1	74.28	68.12	35.73	8.01	39.10
		F	GWD	75.59 (+1.31)	68.36 (+0.24)	40.24 (+4.51)	9.15 (+1.14)	40.80 (+1.70)
D3Dat			KLD	77.72 (+2.43)	71.99 (+3.87)	43.95 (+8.22)	10.43 (+2.42)	43.29 (+4.19)
R ⁻ Det			Smooth L1	75.53	69.69	37.69	9.03	40.56
		R+F	GWD	77.09 (+1.56)	71.52 (+1.83)	41.08 (+3.39)	10.10 (+1.07)	42.17 (+1.61)
· · · · · ·			KLD	79.63 (+4.63)	73.30 (+3.61)	43.51 (+5.82)	10.61 (+1.58)	43.61 (+3.05)



We conducted verification experiments on some more challenging datasets, such as DOTA-v1.5 and DOTA-v2.0 (including many tiny objects less than 10 pixels). KLD still performs best.

Table 5: Accuracy comparison between different rotation detectors on DOTA dataset. [†] and [‡] represent the large aspect ratio object and the square-like object, respectively. The bold **red** and **blue** fonts indicate the top two performances respectively. D_{oc} and D_{le} represent OpenCV Definition $(\theta \in [-90^\circ, 0^\circ))$ and Long Edge Definition $(\theta \in [-90^\circ, 90^\circ))$ of RBox.

Baseline	Method	Box Def	v1.0 tranval/test									V	1.0 train	v1.5	v2.0	
		Box Del.	BR [†]	SV [†]	LV†	SH [†]	HA†	ST [‡]	RAI	7-AP ₅₀	AP ₅₀	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _{50:95}	AP ₅₀	AP ₅₀
		Doc	42.17	65.93	51.11	72.61	53.24	78.38	62.00	60.78	65.73	64.70	32.31	34.50	58.87	44.16
	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	D_{le}	38.31	60.48	49.77	68.29	51.28	78.60	60.02	58.11	64.17	62.21	26.06	31.49	56.10	43.06
	IoU-Smooth L1 [3]	Doc	44.32	63.03	51.25	72.78	56.21	77.98	63.22	61.26	66.99	64.61	34.17	36.23	59.16	46.31
	Modulated Loss [43]	Doc	42.92	67.92	52.91	72.67	53.64	80.22	58.21	61.21	66.05	63.50	33.32	34.61	57.75	45.17
DatinaMat	Modulated Loss [43]	Quad.	43.21	70.78	54.70	72.68	60.99	79.72	62.08	63.45	67.20	65.15	40.59	39.12	61.42	46.71
Reunaivet	RIL [32]	Quad.	40.81	67.63	55.45	72.42	55.49	78.09	64.75	62.09	66.06	64.07	40.98	39.05	58.91	45.35
	CSL [4]	D_{le}	42.25	68.28	54.51	72.85	53.10	75.59	58.99	60.80	67.38	64.40	32.58	35.04	58.55	43.34
	DCL (BCL) [44]	D_{le}	41.40	65.82	56.27	73.80	54.30	79.02	60.25	61.55	67.39	65.93	35.66	36.71	59.38	45.46
	GWD [5]	Doc	44.07	71.92	62.56	77.94	60.25	79.64	63.52	65.70	68.93	65.44	38.68	38.71	60.03	46.65
	KLD	Doc	44.00	74.45	72.48	84.30	65.54	80.03	65.05	69.41	71.28	68.14	44.48	42.15	62.50	47.69
		Doc	44.15	75.09	72.88	86.04	56.49	82.53	61.01	68.31	70.66	67.18	38.41	38.46	62.91	48.43
P3Dat [26]	DCL (BCL) [44]	D_{le}	46.84	74.87	74.96	85.70	57.72	84.06	63.77	69.70	71.21	67.45	35.44	37.54	61.98	48.71
R Det [20]	GWD [5]	Doc	46.73	75.84	78.00	86.71	62.69	83.09	61.12	70.60	71.56	69.28	43.35	41.56	63.22	49.25
	KLD	Doc	48.34	75.09	78.88	86.52	65.48	82.08	61.51	71.13	71.73	68.87	44.48	42.11	65.18	50.90

In the horizontal detection task (COCO dataset), KLD also maintains a similar level with commonly used loss functions, such as GIoU.

Table 6: Performance evaluation of KLD on classic horizontal detection.

Detector	Reg. Loss	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _s	AP_m	$ AP_l $	Detector	Reg. Loss	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _s	AP_m	AP_l
RetinaNet	Smooth L1	37.2	56.6	39.7	21.4	41.1	48.0		Smooth L1	37.9	58.8	41.0	22.4	41.4	49.1
	GIoU	37.4	56.7	39.7	22.2	41.7	48.1	Faster RCNN	GIoU	38.3	58.7	41.5	22.5	41.7	49.7
	KLD	38.0	56.4	40.6	23.3	43.2	49.3		KLD	38.2	58.7	41.7	22.6	41.8	49.3

> We conducted experiments on different variants of KLD on two datasets, and found that the final performance was similar, eliminating the interference of asymmetry on the results.

Table 2: Ablation of different KLD-based regression loss form. The based detector is RetinaNet.

Dataset	$\mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_p \mathcal{N}_t)$	$\mathbf{D}_{kl}(\mathcal{N}_t \mathcal{N}_p)$	$\mathbf{D}_{kl_min}(\mathcal{N}_p \mathcal{N}_t)$	$\mathbf{D}_{kl_max}(\mathcal{N}_p \mathcal{N}_t)$	$\mathbf{D}_{js}(\mathcal{N}_p \mathcal{N}_t)$	$ \mathbf{D}_{jeffreys}(\mathcal{N}_p \mathcal{N}_t) $
DOTA-v1.0	70.17	70.64	70.71	70.55	69.67	70.56
HRSC2016	82.83	83.82	83.60	82.70	84.06	83.66



> Finally, in the SOTA experiment of DOTA-v1.0, we also achieved the highest

performance in the current published papers.

Table 7: AP on different objects on DOTA-v1.0. Here R-101 denotes ResNet-101 (likewise for R-50, R-152), and RX-101 and H-104 represent ResNeXt101 [46] and Hourglass-104 [47], respectively. MS indicates that multi-scale training/testing is used. **Red** and **blue** indicate the top two performances.

	Method	Backbone	MS	PL.	BD	BR	GTF	SV	LV	SH	TC	BC	ST	SBF	RA	HA	SP	HC	AP ₅₀
	ICN [29]	R-101	1	81.40	74.30	47.70	70.30	64.90	67.80	70.00	90.80	79.10	78.20	53.60	62.90	67.00	64.20	50.20	68.20
	RoI-Trans. [11]	R-101	~	88.64	78.52	43.44	75.92	68.81	73.68	83.59	90.74	77.27	81.46	58.39	53.54	62.83	58.93	47.67	69.56
	SCRDet [3]	R-101	1	89.98	80.65	52.09	68.36	68.36	60.32	72.41	90.85	87.94	86.86	65.02	66.68	66.25	68.24	65.21	72.61
20	Gliding Vertex [48]	R-101		89.64	85.00	52.26	77.34	73.01	73.14	86.82	90.74	79.02	86.81	59.55	70.91	72.94	70.86	57.32	75.02
sta	Mask OBB [49]	RX-101	1	89.56	85.95	54.21	72.90	76.52	74.16	85.63	89.85	83.81	86.48	54.89	69.64	73.94	69.06	63.32	75.33
9	CenterMap OBB [50]	R-101	~	89.83	84.41	54.60	70.25	77.66	78.32	87.19	90.66	84.89	85.27	56.46	69.23	74.13	71.56	66.06	76.03
Ę.	FPN-CSL [4]	R-152	~	90.25	85.53	54.64	75.31	70.44	73.51	77.62	90.84	86.15	86.69	69.60	68.04	73.83	71.10	68.93	76.17
	RSDet-II [43]	R-152	~	89.93	84.45	53.77	74.35	71.52	78.31	78.12	91.14	87.35	86.93	65.64	65.17	75.35	79.74	63.31	76.34
	SCRDet++ [51]	R-101	~	90.05	84.39	55.44	73.99	77.54	71.11	86.05	90.67	87.32	87.08	69.62	68.90	73.74	71.29	65.08	76.81
	ReDet [52]	ReR-50	~	88.81	82.48	60.83	80.82	78.34	86.06	88.31	90.87	88.77	87.03	68.65	66.90	79.26	79.71	74.67	80.10
ŝc	PIoU [30]	DLA-34 [53]		80.90	69.70	24.10	60.20	38.30	64.40	64.80	90.90	77.20	70.40	46.50	37.10	57.10	61.9	64.00	60.50
	O ² -DNet [54]	H-104	1	89.31	82.14	47.33	61.21	71.32	74.03	78.62	90.76	82.23	81.36	60.93	60.17	58.21	66.98	61.03	71.04
	DAL [14]	R-101	~	88.61	79.69	46.27	70.37	65.89	76.10	78.53	90.84	79.98	78.41	58.71	62.02	69.23	71.32	60.65	71.78
	P-RSDet [55]	R-101	~	88.58	77.83	50.44	69.29	71.10	75.79	78,66	90.88	80.10	81.71	57.92	63.03	66.30	69.77	63.13	72.30
sta	BBAVectors [56]	R-101	1	88.35	79.96	50.69	62.18	78.43	78.98	87.94	90.85	83.58	84.35	54.13	60.24	65.22	64.28	55.70	72.32
è	DRN [13]	H-104	~	89.71	82.34	47.22	64.10	76.22	74,43	85.84	90.57	86.18	84.89	57.65	61.93	69.30	69.63	58.48	73.23
80	PolarDet [57]	R-101	~	89.65	87.07	48.14	70.97	78.53	80.34	87.45	90.76	85.63	86.87	61.64	70.32	71.92	73.09	67.15	76.64
ŝ	RDD [58]	R-101	1	89.15	83.92	52.51	73.06	77.81	79.00	87.08	90.62	86.72	87.15	63.96	70.29	76.98	75.79	72.15	77.75
	GWD [5]	R-152	~	89.06	84.32	55.33	77.53	76.95	70.28	83.95	89.75	84.51	86.06	73.47	67.77	72.60	75.76	74.17	77.43
	KLD	R-50		88.91	83.71	50.10	68.75	78.20	76.05	84.58	89.41	86.15	85.28	63.15	60.90	75.06	71.51	67.45	75.28
	KLD	R-50	1	88.91	85.23	53.64	81.23	78.20	76.99	84.58	89.50	86.84	86.38	71.69	68.06	75.95	72.23	75.42	78.32
	CFC-Net [31]	R-101	1	89.08	80.41	52.41	70.02	76.28	78.11	87.21	90.89	84.47	85.64	60.51	61.52	67.82	68.02	50.09	73.50
	R ³ Det [26]	R-152	~	89.80	83.77	48.11	66.77	78.76	83.27	87.84	90.82	85.38	85.51	65.67	62.68	67.53	78.56	72.62	76,47
0	DAL [14]	R-50	1	89.69	83.11	55.03	71.00	78.30	81.90	88.46	90.89	84.97	87.46	64.41	65.65	76.86	72.09	64.35	76.95
8	DCL [44]	R-152	1	89.26	83.60	53.54	72.76	79.04	82.56	87.31	90.67	86.59	86.98	67.49	66.88	73.29	70.56	69.99	77.37
2	RIDet [32]	R-50	~	89.31	80.77	54.07	76.38	79.81	81.99	89.13	90.72	83.58	87.22	64.42	67.56	78.08	79.17	62.07	77.62
Ĕ.	S ² A-Net [12]	R-101	1	89.28	84.11	56.95	79.21	80.18	82.93	89.21	90.86	84.66	87.61	71.66	68.23	78.58	78.20	65.55	79.15
Cet	R ³ Det-GWD [5]	R-152	1	89.66	84.99	59.26	82.19	78.97	84.83	87.70	90.21	86.54	86.85	73.04	67.56	76.92	79.22	74.92	80.19
-		R-50		88.90	84.17	55.80	69.35	78.72	84.08	87.00	89.75	84.32	85.73	64.74	61.80	76.62	78.49	70.89	77.36
	R ³ Det-KLD	R-50	1	89.90	84.91	59.21	78.74	78.82	83.95	87.41	89.89	86.63	86.69	70.47	70.87	76.96	79.40	78.62	80.17
	1999 (1999) (1999) (1999) 1999 (1999) (1999) (1999)	R-152	1	89.92	85.13	59.19	81.33	78.82	84.38	87.50	89.80	87.33	87.00	72.57	71.35	77.12	79.34	78.68	80.63



- Paper: <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.01883</u>
- Code: <u>https://github.com/yangxue0827/RotationDetection</u>
- Contact:
 - Xue Yang: <u>yangxue-2019-sjtu@sjtu.edu.cn</u>
 - Junchi Yan: yanjunchi@sjtu.edu.cn
- Homepage of our Lab:
 - <u>http://thinklab.sjtu.edu.cn/</u>