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Abstract: In order to exploit the massive image information and to handle overload, techniques for analyzing image content to facilitate indexing and retrieval of images have emerged. In this paper, a low-level and high-level image semantic annotation based on Fuzzy Petri Net is presented. Knowledge scheme is used to define more general and complex semantic concepts and their relations in the context of the examined outdoor domain. A formal description of hierarchical and spatial relationships among concepts from the outdoor image domain is described. The automatic image annotation procedure based on fuzzy recognition and inheritance algorithm, that maps high-level semantics to image, is presented together with experimental results.
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I. Introduction

Nowadays, digital images are ubiquitous and their number in databases is growing with an incredible speed.

Describing images by their semantic contents can facilitate users to index, retrieve, organize and interact with huge data using existing text searching techniques.

As the majority of the images are barely documented, current research on semantic image retrieval is closely related to automatic image annotation that works toward finding a solution to the problem of automatically linking keywords to an unlabelled image [1].

The basic premise of image auto annotation approaches is that a model describing how low-level image features like color, texture and shape are related to keywords can be learnt from a training set of images. Obtained model is then applied to un-annotated images in order to automatically generate keywords that describe their content. Usually, the keywords with the highest probability are chosen to annotate the image.

For solving the problem of automatic image annotation, many different approaches have been used. A recent survey of methods of image retrieval is given in [2]. Hereafter we will mention some referent methods to point out different approaches used for automatic image annotation. Methods based on translation model [3] and several extensions have assumed automatic image annotation to be analogous to translation problem between languages. Models which use Latent Semantic Analysis transform the features to a vocabulary of visual terms, which represents a purely visual language [4]. Renewal methods based on classifications are used for classifying images into a large number of categories [5]. Paper [6] gives a comparative analysis of (some existing) multi-label classification methods applied to different problem domains and evaluates the performance of such methods for different tasks among which is automatic image annotation.

Paper [7] introduces an algorithm based on the correlation mining of colors in order to utilize image interpretation and to improve the accuracy of image retrieval.

Under the assumption that the basic goal of annotation is the facilitation and improvement of image retrieval, the annotation should contain keywords which user might use during the retrieval.

According to [8], users’ text-based queries consist of two words (on average) although their request is much more subtle, often representing an information or entertainment needs, that would normally require a deeper query of a higher semantic level than keyword or object token itself. For example, during retrieval of images from personal dataset, it is more intuitive to use the keyword “beach” instead of list of concepts like “sand, sea, sky, person” or other objects which can possibly be recognized on images belonging to the mentioned domain. Besides, query “wild-cats” means that someone is looking for “tiger”, “lion”, “leopard” and other wild cats.

For analyzing high-level semantics and searching images more intelligently, the ontology and descriptive logic are often pointed out. Some early work on semantic description of images using ontology was described in [9]. In [10], the ontology with hierarchical classification of image concepts is used to represent the semantics of the whole image. Then, due to the ambiguity and unreliability of facts, authors [11] have been trying to incorporate elements of fuzzy logic into ontology. Later, the same group of authors [12] has reported that environment used by the ontology is shown to be incompatible with that of fuzzy reasoning engines.

The paper reveals an approach to knowledge-based image annotation. The knowledge base is built using representation scheme based on Fuzzy Petri Net that is briefly presented in section two.

An example of knowledge base with formal description of hierarchical and spatial relationships among concepts from the outdoor image domain is described in the third section. The low-level and high-level image automatic annotation
procedure based on fuzzy recognition algorithm, and
generation of abstract concepts at a higher semantic level
using the fuzzy inheritance algorithm, are presented in
section four and five, respectively. Experimental results of
automatic image annotation and discussion are given in
section six.

II. Knowledge Representation Scheme Formalism

In our approach, a knowledge representation scheme based
on Fuzzy Petri Net theory, named KRFPN, is used for
low- and high-level image automatic annotation.

The knowledge representation KRFPN, [13] is defined as
13-tuple:

\[
KRFPN = (P, T, I, O, M, \Omega, \mu, f, c, \alpha, \beta, \lambda, Con),
\]

where:

- \( P = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\}, n \in \mathbb{N} \) is a set of places;
- \( T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m\}, m \in \mathbb{N} \) is a set of transitions;
- \( I: T \rightarrow P^\circ \) is an input function;
- \( O: T \rightarrow P^\bullet \) is an output function;
- \( M = \{m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_r\}, 1 \leq r < \infty \) is a set of tokens;
- \( \Omega: P \rightarrow P(M) \) is a tokens’ distribution within places;
- \( \mu: P \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) is a marking of places;
- \( f: T \rightarrow [0,1] \) is the degree of truth associated with
  the transitions;
- \( c: M \rightarrow [0,1] \) is the degree of truth associated with
  the token;
- \( \alpha: P \rightarrow D \) maps each place \( p_i \in P \) into single concept
  \( d_j \in D \), so \( d_j = \alpha(p_i), i = 1, \ldots, n, j = 1, \ldots, |D| \);
- \( \beta: T \rightarrow \Sigma \) maps each transition \( t_j \in T \) into single
  relation \( \rho_k \in \Sigma \), thus \( \rho_k = \beta(t_j), j = 1, \ldots, m, k = 1, \ldots, |\Sigma| \);
- \( \lambda \in [0,1] \) is a threshold related to transitions firing;
- \( Con \subseteq (D \times D) \cup (\Sigma \times \Sigma) \) contains pairs of a mutually
  contradictory relations and/or concepts.

The KRFPN can be represented by a bipartite direct graph
containing two types of nodes: places and transitions.
Graphically, places \( p_i \in P \) are represented by circles,
transitions \( t_j \in T \) by bars. The relationships, based on input
and output functions are represented by directed arcs. In the
semantic sense, each place \( p_i \) corresponds to a concept from
the set D, and any transition \( t_j \) to a relation from the set \( \Sigma \)
(Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Fuzzy Petri net formalism (place, transition, token) with the associated semantic meaning](image1)

A dot in a place represents token \( m_j \in M \), and a place that
contains one or more tokens is called the marked place.
Complete information about the token is given by a pair
\((p_j, c(m_j))\), where the first component specifies the
place where the token is, and the second one, its truth value.

Tokens give dynamic features to the net and define its
execution by firing an enabled transition \( t_j \). The transition is
enabled when every input place of transition is marked, i.e.
if each of the input places of the transition has at least one
additional token and the value \( m_j \), of each token
exceeds the threshold \( \lambda \). An enabled transition \( t_j \) can
be fired. By firing, a token is moving from all its input places
\( I(t_j) \) to the corresponding output places \( O(t_j) \). In
enabled transitions, token with the maximum value \( m_j \)
takes the role in firing. After firing, new token value is
obtained as \( m_j = c(m_j) \cdot f(t_j) \) in the output place, as shown in
Figure 2.

![Figure 2. New token value is obtained in the output place after firing](image2)

Values \( c(m_j) \) and \( f(t_j) \) are degrees of truth assigned to a
token at the input place \( p_i \in I(t_j) \) and a transition \( t_j \),
respectively. Semantically, the value \( c(m_j) \) expresses the
degree of uncertain assignmnet of concept from the set \( D \)
to the place \( p_i \) while the value \( f(t_j) \) represents the degree of
uncertain assignment of relationship from the set \( \Sigma \)
to the transition \( t_j \). The value of \( c(m_j) \), \( f(t_j) \in [0, 1] \), can be
expressed by truth scales where 0 means «not true» and 1
«always true» [14].

Also, because of the uncertain and ambiguous semantic
interpretation and exceptions in inheritance, a set \( Con \) of
contradiction relations or concepts can explicitly be defined
[13].

The inference procedures (inheritance and recognition)
defined in KRFPN scheme use the dynamical properties of
the net. More details about the KRFPN scheme and
inference procedures can be found in [13].

III. Knowledge Base for Domain Images

To demonstrate a model of low and high-level image
automatic annotation based on the KRFPN scheme, a part
of the image dataset [15], of Corel Photo Library that includes
natural and artificial objects and landscape, is used.

Each image from the dataset was annotated with
the controlled vocabulary according to [3]. Figure 3 displays
image samples and associated annotation.

![Figure 3. Example of images and annotations](image3)
Additionally, images are segmented using the Normalized Cut algorithm [16]. Segmentation is based on grouping of visual similarities of pixels without any concern about the object semantics (Figure 4), so segments do not fully correspond to the objects. We have considered only segments with the area bigger than 2% of the total image area.

**Figure 4.** Example of segmented images

In our experiment, each image segment of interest was manually annotated only with the first keyword from a set of corresponding keywords provided by [15] and used as ground truth for the training model.

A. Image features

Every segmented region of each image is more precisely characterized by a set of 16 feature descriptors, \( A_k \), \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, 16 \). Features are based on color, position, size and shape of the region [15].

In order to simplify the model and to emphasize important information, image features are quantized. We have used the k-means algorithm with the squared Euclidean distance to decide how many quantization levels have to be created for every feature. The algorithm converges quickly, but the obtained solution may not be optimal because it depends on the initial set of cluster centroids and the selected values of \( k \) that define the number of clusters. The algorithm has to be run several times, each time with a new, randomly selected set of initial cluster centroids. In order to choose the optimal number of clusters (quantization levels), the value of \( k \) was increased until the mean of the sum of distances of points within the cluster to cluster centroids terminated to decrease significantly or when it was close to a zero.

B. Model definition

Here, we propose a simple model which maps image features to domain classes represented by keywords.

Analyzing the segments which belong to a certain class, by simple grouping the segments labeled by the same keywords together, the representative descriptor values for each class are computed. Values \( V_k \) of certain descriptive variables \( A_k \) typical for a certain class \( C_i \) have been chosen based on the probability of the intersection of descriptive value occurrence and class occurrence.

Each of the specific value of descriptor \( V_k \) is associated with the degree of probability, based on the conditional probability formula of multiple independent subsets of \( V_k \):

\[
P(V_k = v_{ki} | C = C_i) = \frac{p(v_{ki} = v_{ki} | C = C_i)}{p(v(C = C_i))} = \frac{k(v_{ki} | C_i)}{k(C_i)} \quad (2)
\]

\[\forall v_{ki} \in V, k = 1, 2, \ldots, 16; V_k = Domain (A_k);\]

where:

- \( C = \{ C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n \} \) is a set of classes;
- \( V = \{ V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m \} \) is a set of descriptor values;
- \( V_k = \{ v_{k1}, v_{k2}, \ldots, v_{k|V|} \} \) is a set of values of descriptor \( A_k \), \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, m \), where \( |V| \) is a number of quantization levels for descriptor \( A_k \).

Descriptor values which have conditional probability lower than the threshold are equally associated to the nearest values of descriptors that are higher than the threshold. In this experiment the threshold was set to 0.05.

Because of intra-class variety, each class has usually more than one associated value of a certain descriptive variable. Thus, the occurrences which correspond to one class can be associated with different values of a descriptor.

In this model we have used two kinds of weighting: first, weighting the descriptors’ impact to the classification performance and, second, weighting the descriptor values. We applied Quadratic Discriminate Analyses (QDA) filter [17] separately on each descriptor, and according to the misclassification error of the QDA algorithm, we assigned more weights to more discriminated descriptors (value) for the classification performance, \( w(V_i), i = 1, 2, \ldots, 16 \).

Furthermore, we applied some kind of Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) principle [18] that is mainly used while searching the text to reduce the effect of those terms that appear frequently in many documents and are either not discriminative nor important for distinguishing documents. In this case, using a modified IDF principle to the attribute values, more weight is given to the values that occur rarely for particular descriptor as follows:

\[
w_{IDF, k} = w_{IDF}(v_{ki}) = \log \frac{N}{\sum_{v_{ki} \in V_k} n_{ki}}, \quad \forall v_{ki} \in V_k, \quad (3)
\]

where \( n_{ki} \) is the number of segments that have the value of \( v_{ki} \) for the attribute \( A_k \), and \( N \) is a total number of segments.

To compute the probability of the spatial relationships among classes, we analyzed mutual occurrence of classes in the image annotation. An \( n \times n \) matrix, where \( n \) is a cardinality of the set \( C \), is created. Each element of the matrix can be formally defined as:

\[
P(C = C_i | C = C_j) = \frac{p(C = C_j | C = C_i)}{p(C = C_j)}, \quad i \neq j \quad (4)
\]

In order to model different occurrences of two or more equal classes in an image, the probability \( P(C_i | C_j) \) can be experimentally estimated.

C. Forming knowledge base for domain images

A semantic analysis and knowledge representation of domain images are focused on four semantic categories – elementary classes, generalized classes, derived classes and scene classes. Elementary classes correspond to the object labels which were directly identified in the images like “lion”, “airplane”, “grass”, and “sky”. Generalized classes include classes created by generalizing objects recognized in the image (e.g., “wildcat” is generalization of elementary classes “tiger” and “lion”). High-level generalization...
includes generalization of already generalized classes like: “wildcat” (generalization of elementary class) – “wildlife” (generalization of generalized class) – “animal”, “natural object” (high-level generalization). Same abstract classes that are “common” to human association based on the identified image objects like “winter” for “snow” can be described by derived classes. Scene classes are used to represent the semantics of the whole image like “mountain view” and “outdoor”.

Classes from all semantic categories, according to the model based on KRFPN, are elements of a set D, where \( D = C \cup \text{Inst} \cup V \).

A subset \( C \) includes elementary classes, generalized classes and related more abstract classes as scene and derived classes. Elements of a set \( C \) are initially generated according to the segments’ keyword for images from a training model as follows:

\[ C = \{\text{Airplane}, \text{Bear}, \text{Polar-bear}, \text{Bird}, \text{Fox}, \text{Wolf}, \text{Lion}, \text{Elephant}, \text{Tiger}, \text{Cloud}, \text{Sky}, \text{Water}, \text{Trees}, \text{Grass}, \text{Rock}, \text{Send}, \text{Mountain}, \text{Snow}, \text{Plane}, \text{Train}, \text{Tracks}, \text{Roads}\} \]

A Subset \( \text{Inst} \) includes instances of each class at the entrance to the knowledge base that have to be classified, but may also include some specific instances of the class of interest, which can be already stored in a knowledge base. In this experiment, it was not necessary to store instances in the knowledge base, so elements of the set \( \text{Inst} \) are instances of classes at the entrance to the knowledge base:

\[ \text{Inst} = \{X_i, i=1... n\} \]

A subset \( V \) represents class attributes and consists of descriptor values as determined by quantization of image region features as follows: \( A_1 - \text{size of the region, } A_2 - \text{horizontal position (x), } A_3 - \text{vertical position (y), } A_4 - \text{width, } A_5 - \text{height, } A_6 - \text{boundary/area ratio, } A_7 - \text{convexity, } A_8 - \text{luminance (L), } A_9 - \text{green-red intensity (a), } A_{10} - \text{blue-yellow intensity (b) and } A_{11} - \text{std L, } A_{12} - \text{std a, } A_{13} - \text{std b, } A_{14} - \text{L skew coefficients, } A_{15} - \text{a skew coefficients, } A_{16} - \text{b skew coefficients. Descriptors } A_1 - A_7 \text{ refer to geometrical properties of the region while descriptors } A_8 - A_{16} \text{ are related to CIE L*a*b color model components and corresponding standard deviation and skew coefficients of that components. A set of descriptor values is:} \]

\[ V = \{V_1 = (\text{size1, size2, ..., size10}), V_2 = (\text{xpos1, ..., xpos10}), V_3 = (\text{ypos1, ..., ypos11}), V_4 = (\text{hight1, ..., hight7}), V_5 = (\text{width1, ..., width6}), V_6 = (\text{bound1, ..., bound7}), V_7 = (\text{conv1, conv2, conv3}), V_8 = (\text{L1, ..., L5}), V_9 = (\text{a1, ..., a7}), V_{10} = (\text{b1, ..., b6}), V_{11} = (\text{stdL1, ..., stdL6}), V_{12} = (\text{stda1, ..., stda8}), V_{13} = (\text{stdb1, ..., stdb5}), V_{14} = (\text{skewL1, ..., skewL12}), V_{15} = (\text{skewa1, skewa2, skewa3}), V_{16} = (\text{skewb1, skewb2, skewb3}) \} \]

Relations from the set \( \Sigma \) are defined according to the expert knowledge on relations between concepts in the domain. The set \( \Sigma \) of relations is a union of hierarchical relations (\( \Sigma_1 \)), relations between class \( C \) and values of its attributes from set \( V_k \) (\( \Sigma_2 \)) and spatial and co-occurrence relationships among classes (\( \Sigma_3 \)).

A set of relations \( \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3 \) is defined in the following manner:

\[ \Sigma_1 = \{\text{is_a, is_part_of}\}; \]

\[ \Sigma_2 = \{\text{has_size, has_xpos, has_ypos, has_width, has_hight, has_boundary_area, has_convexity, has_Lum, has_green_red, has_blue_yellow, has_std_L, has_std_a, has_std_b, has_skew_L, has_skew_a, has_skew_b\}; \]

\[ \Sigma_3 = \{\text{is_on, on_top, on_bottom, is_above, is_below}\}. \]

In Figure 5 a part of knowledge base is presented, showing relations among particular classes from the set \( C \) and appropriate values of descriptors from the set \( V \) defined by the former procedure. To every transition from the set \( \Sigma_2 \) that models the relation among attribute values and a class, a probability (degree of truth) is assigned according to (2). For example, the degree of truth of relation between the particular class “Sky” and the descriptor value “ypos2” is 0.38 (Fig.5).

![Figure 5. Part of relations among class ‘Sky’ and its attributes](image)

From the set of spatial and co-occurrence relationships, we have mostly used relation “is_on”. The degree of truth is defined according to the frequency of mutual occurrence of classes in the image domain, according to (3). Figure 6 displays relations among class “Airplane” and classes that are usually found on the image when class “Airplane” is detected.

![Figure 6. Example of co-occurrence relationships](image)

More accurate spatial relationships (e.g., is_below, is above, is near) among domain concepts, as presented in the Figure 7, are defined using general knowledge and analyzing the location of objects in the image. These relationships are useful for validating and improving the results of automatic image annotation.
The set $D$ of semantic concepts is, using expert knowledge, expanded with generalizations of concepts as well as with synonyms that can be useful in image retrieval. When defining the concepts generalization or synonyms, the lexical databases like WordNet [19] can be used.

Generalizations of concepts in the knowledge base are obtained by hierarchical relation as shown in Figure 8. The degree of truth is set according to the expert knowledge.
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For all levels of each recognition tree represented by vector $\pi^k (k = 1, 2, ..., b; b = 16$ for this example), the sum of nodes $z^k$ is computed:

$$z^k = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \pi^k_i, \quad k = 1, 2, ..., 16,$$

(6)

where $p$ is the number of nodes in the $k$-th recognition tree excluding the root node ($p=21$ for the first recognition tree).

Accordingly, total sum of all nodes for all recognition trees is given by:

$$Z = \sum_{k=1}^{b} z^k,$$

(7)

where $b$ is the number of all recognition trees ($b=16$ for this example).

If there are some initial properties that include the relations from the set $\Sigma_3$, then the recognition sub-trees with selective firing are constructed and all nodes without enabled transitions (terminal nodes) are computed by augmenting the total sum in (8). For the example above, the total amount of nodes in all recognition trees calculated by the formula (8) is as follows:

$$i^* = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z_i.$$

(8)

For this example $i^* = 20$, thus place p20 (indicated with bold font) is selected and after applying formula for semantic interpretation, $\alpha(p34) = \text{‘Sky’}$, class ‘Sky’ is selected as the best match for a given set of attribute values.

After recognition, image segments are classified into classes with the best matching as shown in Figure 11.
V. Class Generalization Using Fuzzy Inheritance Algorithm

If properties of each class in the knowledge base and its relations with parent classes should be displayed or analyzed, fuzzy inheritance algorithm is most suitable for this purpose [13].

For a given class that exists in the knowledge base, the appropriate place is determined by the formula $\alpha^{-1}(d_j) = p_1$, $d_j \in D$. According to the initially marked place and appropriate token value, the initial token distribution is created representing the root node of inheritance tree.

Token value $c(m_k)$ can be set to a value obtained by the recognition algorithm. The inheritance tree is formed by firing the enabled transitions until the condition for stopping the algorithm is satisfied or the desired depth of inheritance tree is reached.

Semantic interpretation of arches that connect nodes in parent - child relationship forms statements and paths of inheritance. The resulting inheritance paths describe: class attributes (elements from set $V$ for elementary classes and elementary classes for scene classes), spatial and pseudo-spatial relationships between elementary classes (e.g. “Airplane occurs with Sky” or “Airplane is above Water”) and parent classes whether of the elementary classes or of the generalized classes (e.g. “Airplane is Vehicle AND is Man-made Object AND is Outdoor Scene”).

For each of the inheritance paths the measure of truth is determined by the token value in the leaf node.

VI. Experimental Results

The data set used for the experiments is taken from Corel Stock photo library (prepared according to [15]). It consists of 475 segmented images (with a total of 4835 segments) that were divided into the training and the testing subsets by 10-fold cross validation with 20% of observations for holdout cross-validation. Each segment in the training set was initially annotated with one of the 22 semantic concepts.

Using a simple model which maps image features to domain classes and expert knowledge, a knowledge base was developed to represent the domain concepts of interest and their hierarchical and spatial relations.

After building the domain knowledge, an automatic semantic annotation of images in the test set can be performed following the fuzzy recognition algorithm on the proposed scheme.

Since the ground truth annotations of the images in the test set, concerning the image classes and suggested by humans, are known, it is possible to determine which obtained image annotations are relevant to a particular image and thus calculate precision and recall.

Precision is the ratio of correctly predicted keywords, and the total number of keywords that were obtained by automatic annotation, while recall is the ratio of correctly predicted keywords and all keywords for the image (ground-truth annotations).

Figure 12 presents the average per-word precision and recall for the automatic annotation experiments. The keywords (classes) are on precision-recall graph marked with class id.

The results in Figure 12 show that better results are achieved for recall than for precision. The average precision rate is 37%, while average recall rate is 48%.

Good results, over 50% of precision are obtained for elementary classes with ID 3, 7, 11, 15, 20 and 21 that have labels 'bird', 'grass', 'polar-bear', 'sky', 'trees', 'water', respectively. The highest recall, over 70% was achieved for classes with ID 8, 11, 18 and 19 that correspond to labels 'ground', 'polar-bear', 'tracks' and 'train'. Only one class has precision and recall result less than 20%, a ‘mountain’ class, while the majority of other classes have results of precision and recall between 20 and 50%.

Some explanations of obtained results are as follows. Instead of class ‘mountain’, in automatic annotation class ‘trees’ is often used, as the mountains in the image are usually covered by trees, so it is difficult to decide, even when annotating manually, which label would better describe the image.

Furthermore, the class ‘cloud’ is often in automatic annotation replaced with ‘sky’ or vice versa since the boundary between these classes was not precisely defined in manual annotation, which was used for training. Similar case is with the classes ‘ground’ and ‘grass’.

Some classes appear in only few images, as classes ‘fox’ with ID 6 and ‘sand’ with ID 14, so the model for them might not be correctly set. Available solution to address this problem is using more samples and fine tuning of truth degree of the particular transitions. A similar solution can be used for classes that are not properly included in the model because of many variations in their appearance, caused either by bad segmentation, difference in illumination, occlusions, etc.

Obtained results can be considered as relatively good, especially when taking into account that a relatively small set was used for learning as well as that images were segmented automatically. Automatic image segmentation rarely achieves accurate segmentation of objects and obtained segments often include several different objects often combined with parts of the background as 'sky', 'grass' and 'trees'.

Moreover, higher semantic concepts that could not be directly identified in an image are not included in results depicted in Figure 12. Namely, elementary classes are obtained as results of low-level image feature classification,
so this is a reason that higher semantic concepts could not even be directly identified or included in evaluation of precision and recall.

We have used fuzzy recognition and inheritance algorithms and elementary classes to obtain the higher semantic level concepts. These concepts are used for image classification at more abstract level, such as scene classification.

In Table 1, examples of image annotation using both recognition and inheritance inference procedures are represented. The first row below each image in Table 1 shows results of low-level image classification, while the second row represents image annotations on more abstract level that involves classification of scenes and results of high-level class generalization.

### Table 1. Examples of low-level and high-level image classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Level Classifications</th>
<th>High-Level Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'train', 'tracks', 'sky'</td>
<td>'dolphin', 'water'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Train Scene', 'Vehicle', 'Man-Made Object', 'Outdoor'</td>
<td>'Dolphin scene', 'Sea', 'Natural Scenes', 'Outdoor Scene'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'water', 'sand', 'sky', 'road'</td>
<td>'Coast', 'Landscape', 'Natural Scenes', 'Outdoor Scene'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Conclusion

Automatic image annotation has emerged as an alternative which can enhance image management and retrieval. The aim is to annotate image with concepts of a higher semantic level that will correspond to keywords which users intuitively use during image retrieval.

It is difficult to infer high-level semantics from the image features, because it is necessary to explore all image objects and their relations, and include knowledge necessary for semantic interpretation of overall image.

In this paper, the KRFPN formalism based on Fuzzy Petri Net was used for knowledge representation. This representation uses a simple graphical notation with just a few types of elements and has a well-defined semantics so the model is easily understood. The well-defined inference algorithms can be used for image annotations at various semantic levels of abstraction. The complexity of the algorithm is $O(nm)$ where $n$ is the number of places and $m$ the number of transitions in KRFPN scheme.

Furthermore, an important property of the KRFPN formalism is the ability to show the uncertain knowledge using truth value of the concept and relation. In the paper, a model which maps feature descriptors to domain classes is shortly specified. In this model two kinds of weighting that concern weighting the descriptors impact to the classification performance and weighting the descriptor values are used.

Also, a part of knowledge base that includes relationships among concepts, particularly generalization, spatial relationships and relationships among class and its attributes, is presented.

Moreover, higher semantic concepts that could not be directly identified in the image, like scene classes and generalization of classes, are inferred using fuzzy recognition and inheritance algorithms and elementary classes.

The preliminary research is limited to a particular domain of outdoor images, but we believe that our approach will be suitable to image databases from different domains because the methodology of acquiring knowledge and inference in the KRFPN scheme is expandable and adaptable.
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