
Aligned Unsupervised Pretraining of Object Detectors with Self-training

Ioannis Maniadis Metaxas^{1*} Adrian Bulat²
Ioannis Patras¹ Brais Martinez² Georgios Tzimiropoulos^{1,2}
¹Queen Mary University of London ²Samsung AI Cambridge

Abstract

The unsupervised pretraining of object detectors has recently become a key component of object detector training, as it leads to improved performance and faster convergence during the supervised fine-tuning stage. Existing unsupervised pretraining methods, however, typically rely on low-level information to define proposals that are used to train the detector. Furthermore, in the absence of class labels for these proposals, an auxiliary loss is used to add high-level semantics. This results in complex pipelines and a task gap between the pretraining and the downstream task. We propose a framework that mitigates this issue and consists of three simple yet key ingredients: (i) richer initial proposals that do encode high-level semantics, (ii) class pseudo-labeling through clustering, that enables pretraining using a standard object detection training pipeline, (iii) self-training to iteratively improve and enrich the object proposals. Once the pretraining and downstream tasks are aligned, a simple detection pipeline without further bells and whistles can be directly used for pretraining and, in fact, results in state-of-the-art performance on both the full and low data regimes, across detector architectures and datasets, by significant margins. We further show that our pretraining strategy is *also* capable of pretraining from scratch (including the backbone) and works on complex images like COCO, paving the path for unsupervised representation learning using object detection directly as a pretext task.

1 Introduction

Object detection has been a major challenge in computer vision and the focus of extensive research efforts. Two complementary avenues of research have led to several breakthroughs: a) more powerful architectures, such as the end-to-end single stage DETR [1] family of detectors, and b) unsupervised detector pretraining, which leverages unlabeled data to improve performance on downstream tasks where annotations are expensive, ambiguous, and/or imprecise. Notably, existing pretraining methods largely focus on DETR detectors, as they are the current state-of-the-art, but show slow training convergence and are sample inefficient (i.e. require large amounts of annotated data).

Typically, unsupervised detector pretraining methods generate object proposals (bounding boxes or segmentation masks) randomly [2], through heuristic-based methods [3], or using unsupervised localization techniques [4]. The pretraining task is then to localize the proposals in the image and to distinguish object vs no-object regions. Thus, while the downstream task (detection) requires *both* the localization and the classification of the objects, proposals are typically generated using low-level information and neglect class-level information. To add discrimination based on high-level semantics, current methods typically add a second auxiliary loss, often a variant of contrastive learning. As a result, their pipelines often involve student-teacher models, feature-matching objectives, aggressive

*Corresponding author: i.maniadismetaxas@qmul.ac.uk




Figure 1: **AptDet overview:** (i) Object proposals are extracted from images in an unsupervised manner and assigned pseudo-labels via clustering; (ii) The pseudo-labeled object proposals are used to train the detector, which learns to localize objects and discriminate their pseudo-class label; (iii) The detector then generates a new set of proposals and pseudo-labels, which are used for self-training.

color & cropping augmentations, and other complex and computationally costly mechanisms. Despite these efforts, the two aspects (localization and discrimination) are not adequately integrated, leading to a task gap with the downstream task. Consequently, most current detector pretraining methods suffer large performance degradation when unfreezing the backbone, highlighting the task misalignment problem and preventing the end-to-end joint pretraining of the detector head and the backbone.

This work proposes AptDet (Aligned PreTraining for Detection), a novel detector pretraining framework that solves the aforementioned limitations, achieves state-of-the-art performance across benchmarks, and can effectively train the entire detector architecture (backbone and detector head) jointly, and even from scratch, and on scene-centric images, e.g. COCO or OpenImages. Our method, seen in Fig. 1, has three main components, which we show *are all needed* for highly effective pretraining: (i) **Unsupervised proposal extraction from feature maps:** We obtain proposals based on high-level semantic information by clustering feature maps produced by a self-supervised backbone. We average the resulting masks to obtain an embedding for each proposal that captures high-level semantics. (ii) **Detector pretraining with pseudo-labels:** The per-proposal high-level semantic embeddings are then clustered across the dataset, and cluster membership is used as pseudo-class labels. We then use the proposals and pseudo-class labels as training data in a standard object detection training pipeline. (iii) **Iterative self-training:** We observe that the detector resulting from component (ii) can produce better proposals than the ones it was trained on. We find that detection pretraining can be applied in an iterative fashion, where the current pretrained model produces the pseudo-labels to train itself further with improved supervision.

We conduct extensive experiments with several detector architectures and report two main findings: (1) **Improved detection & segmentation accuracy:** AptDet consistently outperforms previous works by significant margins, across architectures, and benchmarks for unsupervised detector pretraining. (2) **Self-supervised representation learning from complex images:** We show that AptDet can effectively train the whole network (detector head and backbone jointly) from scratch directly, and on complex images, demonstrating impressive flexibility for unsupervised representation learning.

2 Related Works

Unsupervised object detector pretraining: Object detector pretraining methods aim to pretrain the detector architecture, in addition to the backbone. Previous work in this area has mostly focused on DETR detectors, which can achieve great performance but exhibit sample inefficiency and slow convergence. Thus, detector pretraining (as opposed to backbone-only pretraining) is an important task for such methods. Among these, UP-DETR [2] proposed randomly selecting areas from each image, extracting feature representations, and injecting them into the DETR detector’s queries. The detector was then trained to localize the areas to which the injected representations corresponded. DETReg [3] subsequently used Selective Search [5] to generate object proposals as annotations for the detector. The detector was trained both to localize the proposals and represent them, mimicking a pretrained backbone encoder. JoinDet [6] improved upon DETReg by replacing Selective Search with a dynamic object proposal method that inferred the location of objects from the detector’s internal activations. Siamese DETR [7] used instead a student-teacher multi-view architecture for pretraining where, in addition to class-agnostic localization, the detector is trained to learn transformation-invariant representations at the global (image) and local (object) level. Finally, SeqCo-DETR [8] proposed sequence consistency as a pretext task, combined with a masking strategy. Notably, most of these works freeze the detector’s backbone encoder during pretraining, as they suffer performance

Table 1: Key distinctions among unsupervised detector pretraining methods.

Method	Downstream Task Alignment	Self-Training	Backbone Pre-training	Proposals from high-level semantics	Rich Object Proposals
AlignDet [9]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
FreeSOLO [9]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
CutLER [4]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
UP-DETR [2]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
DETR _{reg} [3]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
JoinDet [6]	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
SeqCo-DETR [8]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Siamese DETR [7]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
AptDet	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

drops otherwise [2, 3]. This is a significant limitation, as it prevents true end-to-end self-supervised training, and makes such frameworks heavily dependent on the quality of the pretrained backbone. Beyond DETR-focused works, AlignDet [9] focused on pretraining on the smaller COCO dataset using contrastive learning. Importantly, all of these works uniformly pretrain detectors in a *class-unaware manner* and rely on auxiliary objectives to improve the detectors’ discriminative capacity. This creates a misalignment between the pretraining task and the downstream task of class-aware object detection, which limits the pretraining’s effectiveness. We emphasize that this also applies to AlignDet, which uses the term alignment to describe the fact that the detector is pretrained and fine-tuned on the same dataset (COCO). This is entirely distinct from our approach of explicitly aligning the objectives of the pretext and downstream tasks. Notably, when compared with AlignDet, we show that AptDet outperforms it by a significant margin.

Unsupervised backbone pretraining for dense prediction: Most works on unsupervised pretraining focus on pretraining the network backbone, rather than the full object detection network [10–25]. Specifically, works in this area do not include a localization component (i.e. they do not localize objects in images) and typically only pretrain the backbone focusing solely on representation learning. They are, therefore, distinct from unsupervised detector pretraining works, which train the detector and include a localization task, while often using pretrained backbones as initialization.

Unsupervised object localization: Different from object detector pretraining, this task aims to localize all objects in an image in an unsupervised manner, without considering class information [26–31]. Among these works, CutLER [4] and FreeSOLO [31] are notable for also using self-training. We emphasize that the main goal of these works is object localization/discovery, not the training of powerful detectors. Accordingly, the detectors trained by these works typically are not evaluated by finetuning with annotated data. Such methods also typically restrict their proposals to the most confident few (often just one) to avoid false positives, which is not well suited for detector pretraining, where training benefits from a rich set of object proposals covering as many objects (or object parts) as possible, not only the few most prominent ones. We validate this in our experiments, where we outperform the state-of-the-art in unsupervised object localization [4].

Summary of differences with previous works: We outline the features of AptDet relative to previous works in Table 1. AptDet fundamentally differs from previous works in the following respects: **i)** Whereas previous works define better auxiliary training tasks, we move away from this paradigm and instead align the pretraining and downstream tasks. This simplifies the training process and improves performance. **ii)** Our proposal extraction and self-training approach produces object proposals that are based on high-level semantic information and are rich and varied, in order to train a powerful detector. That is in contrast, in terms of both implementation and motivation, to works such as CutLER, where proposals are aggressively filtered to a very few confident candidates to promote accurate localization, both in the extraction and self-training stages. **iii)** AptDet is designed to facilitate end-to-end detector pretraining, including the backbone, and we demonstrate its effectiveness across architectures and even with from-scratch pretraining. Instead, prior works almost entirely focus on fine-tuning the detection head while keeping the backbone frozen.

3 Method

AptDet aims to simplify and better align the pretraining with respect to the downstream task (class-aware detection). To this end, we produce object proposals in the form of *bounding box and*




Figure 2: Overview of AptDet’s pretraining Stage 1 for a DETR-based detector. Pseudo-labeled region proposals are extracted at the start of training, leveraging a self-supervised pretrained backbone. Those proposals are then used to train the detector to both localize objects within the image, and to discriminate their pseudo-labels.

pseudo-class label pairs in an unsupervised manner and then employ a self-training strategy to pretrain and iteratively refine the detector.

3.1 Improved object proposals

Existing works either generate a very limited initial set of proposals to facilitate high precision, or use methods like Selective Search [5] that can generate many proposals by relying on low-level priors such as color and texture. Both are suboptimal, the former due to the weaker supervisory signal and the latter because it does not capture high-level semantics. Our aim is to address this gap by utilizing semantic information from self-supervised image encoders to produce rich object proposals and coherent pseudo-class labels. Specifically, we extract feature maps using a pretrained self-supervised encoder and leverage a bi-level clustering strategy. The first level (termed local clustering) results in bounding box proposals and associated feature representations. The second level, termed global clustering, uses cluster membership to assign a pseudo-class label to each proposal. Our method leads to rich and diverse region proposals and is essential for the state-of-the-art results of AptDet, which we discuss in detail in the ablations presented in Appendix E.

Unsupervised proposal extraction: Given an input image $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times H \times W}$, we use a self-supervised pretrained encoder to extract feature maps $\mathbf{F}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{d_l \times H_l \times W_l}$ from each of the encoder’s levels l . Given a feature map \mathbf{F} , we employ pixel-wise clustering to group semantically similar features (local clustering). This results in a set of masks $\mathbf{M} = \{\mathbf{m}_k\}_{k=1:K}$, where K represents the number of clusters, which is a user-defined parameter. To provide good coverage for all objects in the image, we apply clustering with different values $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and use feature maps from different layers $l \in \mathcal{L}$, leading to a set of masks $\mathbb{M} = \bigcup \{\mathbf{M}^{l,K}\}_{K \in \mathcal{K}, l \in \mathcal{L}}$. Next, the different connected components of each mask are computed, leading to a set of regions \mathbb{R} . Each region $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}$ is then used to extract a bounding box (proposal) b and a corresponding feature vector f , where f is computed by average-pooling the last layer feature map \mathbf{F}_L over \mathbf{r} .

Proposal filtering: Due to the clustering at multiple levels of the encoder, the process leads to noisy and overlapping proposals. We employ a number of filters to refine them, such as merging proposals that have a high IoU and proposals with highly related semantic content. This results in a set of $N(i)$ bounding box-feature vector pairs for image i , $\{b_n, f_n\}_{n=1}^{N(i)}$.

Pseudo-class label generation: We then cluster proposals across the whole dataset (global clustering) based on the feature vectors, i.e. we perform a single clustering round on $\{f_n^i\}_{n=1:N(i)}^{i=1:I}$, obtaining clusters S_c for $c \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{C}\}$. This results in a training set $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{X_i, \{(b_n^i, c_n^i)\}\}$, where c_n^i is defined by cluster membership, i.e. $f_n^i \in S_{c_n^i}$. We use Spectral Clustering [32] for local and K-Means for global clustering in order to facilitate scaling to large datasets: while Spectral Clustering typically performs better, K-Means is much more efficient and can handle billions of data points [33]. Therefore, we chose K-Means over alternative clustering algorithms to present and evaluate AptDet in its most scalable form. We note, however, that any clustering algorithm may be used in either case.

3.2 Pretraining and Self-Training

We can now use the training set \mathcal{T}_0 to train an object detector. In particular, given an input image and its corresponding extracted object proposals y , the network predicts a set $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \{\hat{y}_q\}_{q=1}^Q$, where $\hat{y}_q = (\hat{b}_q, \hat{c}_q)$ comprises the predicted bounding box and predicted category. We note that the extracted proposals y are padded to size Q with \emptyset (no object). We emphasize that AptDet is compatible with *any detector architecture*, as we train the detector on simple class-aware detection. Here, for ease of notation and without loss of generality, we assume a DETR-based detector. The ground truth and the predictions are put in correspondence via bipartite matching, formally defined in Eq. (1), where \mathfrak{S}_Q is the space of permutations of Q elements. The loss between \mathbf{y} and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is computed in Eq. (2), as a combination of a bounding box matching loss and a class matching loss:

$$\hat{\sigma} = \arg \min_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_Q} \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{q=1}^Q \left(-\log \hat{p}_{\hat{\sigma}(q)}(c_q) + \mathbf{1}_{\{c_q \neq \emptyset\}} \mathcal{L}_{box}(b_q, \hat{b}_{\hat{\sigma}(q)}) \right), \quad (2)$$

where \hat{p} indicates the predicted per-class probabilities. The indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{c_i \neq \emptyset}$ represents that the box loss only applies to predictions that have been matched to object proposals y . Minimizing this loss results in weights Θ_0 .

Upon training the detector in this way, we observe that it can identify more objects than those in our original proposals. Critically, this includes smaller and more challenging objects, which contribute to a stronger supervisory signal. We thus generate a new set of pseudo-labels for image i as $\{g(X_i; \Theta_0)\}$, where $g = (g_b, g_h)$ are the detection network, backbone and head respectively. Previous methods that leverage self-training [31, 4] filter proposals through a confidence threshold. AptDet deviates from this strategy: we consider the top-100 proposals of the detector and filter them only in terms of overlap, so that any two boxes have an IOU lower than 0.55 (following [34]), with only the most confident box being kept when such conflicts exist. We make this choice for two reasons. Firstly, it allows for straightforward application across architectures: different detector architectures/sizes have different behaviors in terms of prediction confidence, which would require tuning the threshold for each case. Secondly, our approach provides better supervision for the pretraining task: we find that a confidence threshold leads to the removal of challenging instances (e.g. small, partially occluded, or uncommon objects). While previous methods focused on object localization and therefore sought to minimize false positives, our goal is to train a strong detector, which requires the supervisory signal of challenging instances. After this filtering is applied, the result is a new training set \mathcal{T}_1 . A new set of weights Θ_i can be obtained by using the training set \mathcal{T}_i and using Θ_{i-1} to initialize the weights. Simultaneously, Θ_i can be used to generate a new training set \mathcal{T}_{i+1} . While this process can be iterated indefinitely, we notice optimal performance involves just two rounds of training, which we refer to as Stages 1 & 2. Stage 1 training, including the proposal extraction process for \mathcal{T}_0 is shown in Fig. 2. The whole method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

We highlight that, importantly, the proposed pretraining is very well-aligned with the downstream task, i.e. supervised class-aware object detection, and it allows the pretraining of *both* the backbone and the detection head simultaneously. This is unlike other detector pretraining methods [2, 3, 6] that require freezing the backbone to avoid performance degradation.

4 Experimental Setting

We apply AptDet to two DETR-based architectures (Deformable DETR [35] and ViDT+ [36]) and two R-CNN architectures (Mask R-CNN [37], Cascade Mask R-CNN [38]), focusing on the former, as DETR’s end-to-end single-stage architecture performs better and is better suited for representation learning. Following [3, 4], Def. DETR and Cascade Mask R-CNN detectors use ResNet-50 [39] backbones initialized with SwAV [40] and DINO [41] respectively. ViDT+ uses a Swin-T [42] backbone initialized with MoBY [43], unless stated otherwise. In all cases, the backbones were trained in a fully unsupervised manner on ImageNet. To compare with prior work on object detection pretraining, we follow [3] for Def. DETR and ViDT+, [4] for Cascade Mask R-CNN and [9] for Mask R-CNN in terms of datasets, hyperparameters, and experiments. For unsupervised representation

Table 2: **Object detection results on COCO.** Methods are pretrained on ImageNet, finetuned on MS COCO `train2017` and evaluated on `val2017`. 1: Backbone initialized with MoBY and pretrained with AptDet (pretrained detection head was discarded).

Detector	Backbone Pretraining	Detector Pretraining	Frozen Backbone	AP
Cascade Mask R-CNN [38]	DINO	-	✗	44.4
		CutLER [4]	✗	44.7
		AptDet	✗	45.0
Def. DETR [35]	SwAV	-	-	45.2
		UP-DETR [2]	✓	44.7
		DETReg [3]	✓	45.5
		JoinDet [6]	✓	45.6
		SeqCo-DETR [8]	✓	45.8
		Siamese DETR [7]	✓	46.3
		AptDet	✗	46.7
ViDT+ [36]	MoBY	-	-	48.3
	AptDet ¹	-	-	48.8
	MoBY	DETReg	✓	49.1
	MoBY	DETReg	✗	47.8
	MoBY	AptDet	✗	49.6

Table 3: **Object detection results on PASCAL VOC.** Methods are pretrained on ImageNet, finetuned on PASCAL VOC `trainval07+2012` and evaluated on `test07`.

Method	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅
SwAV	61.0	83.0	68.1
DETReg	63.5	83.3	70.3
JoinDet	63.7	83.8	70.7
SeqCo-DETR	64.1	83.3	70.3
AptDet	64.8	84.6	72.7

Table 4: **Object detection results with COCO pretraining.** Mask R-CNN [37] is pretrained and finetuned on MS COCO `train2017` and evaluated on `val2017`. The ResNet50 backbone is initialized with SwAV [40].

Detector Pretraining	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅
-	41.6	62.2	45.8
AlignDet [9]	42.3	62.5	46.7
AptDet	43.2	64.2	47.4

learning, in the absence of a predefined protocol, we use ViDT+ and experiment with the most well-established datasets in object detection. Specific hyperparameters and information on the datasets are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B respectively. Unless stated otherwise, for methods other than AptDet we report results from the respective papers, except where ViDT+ is used.

5 Experiments

We highlight two main results, namely state-of-the-art results for detection pretraining and competitive results for self-supervised representation learning for detection, including pretraining on scene-centric data such as COCO and OpenImages **from scratch**. We complement these results with a comprehensive set of ablation studies presented in Appendix E.

5.1 Object detection pretraining

We evaluate AptDet following the standard protocol for object detection pretraining, as defined by [3] for DETR-based architectures, [4] for Cascade Mask R-CNN and [9] for Mask R-CNN, which include experiments in the full-data, semi-supervised and few-shot settings.

Full data setting: We provide a comprehensive set of comparisons with detector pretraining methods in Table 2, where we pretrain 3 detector architectures on ImageNet, finetune on COCO `train2017` and evaluate on `val2017`. We also report results for ImageNet pretraining and PASCAL VOC finetuning with Def. DETR in Table 3. Finally, following the experimental regime proposed by [9], we pretrain and evaluate a Mask R-CNN detector on MS-COCO, see Table 4. As Tables 2 to 4 show, our method significantly outperforms competing detector pretraining methods across datasets and

Table 5: **Semi-supervised results against detector pretraining methods.** Def. DETR is pretrained on MS COCO `train2017`, finetuned on $k\%$ labeled samples, and evaluated on `val2017`.

Method	AP			
	1%	2%	5%	10%
SwAV	11.79±0.3	16.02±0.4	22.81±0.3	27.79±0.2
DETReg	14.58±0.3	18.69±0.2	24.80±0.2	29.12±0.2
JoinDet	15.89±0.2	-	-	30.87±0.1
AptDet	18.19±0.1	21.80±0.2	26.90±0.2	30.97±0.2

Table 6: **Semi-supervised results against unsupervised localization methods.** FreeSOLO uses SOLOv2 [44] and is pretrained on MS COCO `train2017+unlabeled2017`. CutLER and AptDet use Cascade Mask R-CNN and are pretrained on ImageNet. All methods are finetuned on MS COCO `train2017` and evaluated on `val2017`.

Method	AP (Box / Mask)				
	1%	2%	5%	10%	100%
FreeSOLO	- / -	- / -	- / 22.0	- / 25.6	- / -
CutLER	16.8 / 14.6	21.6 / 18.9	27.8 / 24.3	32.2 / 28.1	44.7 / 38.5
AptDet	20.8 / 17.5	25.2 / 21.2	30.0 / 25.5	33.8 / 29.0	45.0 / 38.8

with all 4 detector architectures. Interestingly, all prior work on DETR pretraining requires freezing the backbone. We quantitatively assess the impact of this requirement by making the DETReg backbone trainable, and observe steep performance degradation. Contrary to all these works, AptDet supports a trainable backbone due to its better alignment of the pretraining and downstream tasks.

Semi-supervised setting: We present results in Table 5 for Def. DETR, pretrained on COCO `train2017` and fine-tuned on $k\%$ labeled samples, following [3]. In Table 6 we compare with works focusing on unsupervised localization following [4], where we pretrained a Cascade Mask R-CNN on ImageNet and fine-tuned on COCO `train2017` with $k\%$ samples, including instance segmentation results. In both cases, AptDet outperforms previous works by large margins, particularly in the more challenging settings with fewer labeled samples. Notably, despite our pretraining being focused on detection, our method outperforms FreeSOLO and CutLER in segmentation performance as well, which highlights its effectiveness.

Few-shot setting: We follow the protocol defined in [3], namely we pretrain Def. DETR on ImageNet and report results for two settings on COCO `train2014`: a) we directly finetune on COCO with $k \in \{10, 30\}$ instances from all classes, b) before the k -shot finetuning stage, we first finetune with annotations from the 60 base classes. Results are reported in Table 7 on the novel classes of `val2014`, and demonstrate that AptDet outperforms DETReg by significant margins. Furthermore, AptDet’s performance without base class finetuning is very close to its performance with it. These results support that a) our method drastically reduces detector architectures’ dependency on annotated data, and b) AptDet’s learned representations are already class-aware, and the pseudo-labels produced by our method are good enough that AptDet can align with COCO’s classes with minimal (10-shot) supervision. We conduct a more in-depth analysis of the few-shot setting outcomes and the convergence properties of AptDet in Appendix D.

5.2 Self-supervised representation learning on scene-centric images

In this section, we examine AptDet’s performance on scene-centric data, and its ability to learn self-supervised representations (i.e., train a backbone). We begin by validating that AptDet, when trained on scene-centric data (e.g. COCO), can perform competitively compared to ImageNet pretraining. Then, we use AptDet directly for self-supervised representation learning on scene-centric data (i.e., training from scratch on COCO/Open Images), showing promising results. Finally, we show that pretraining on COCO leads to representations that transfer to ImageNet under the linear-probe setting.

Object vs Scene-centric pretraining: In Table 8, we present results for AptDet when the detector is pretrained on object-centric and scene-centric data of varying quantity. Specifically, keeping the initialization as described in Section 4, we further pretrain ViDT+ on MS COCO `train2017` and

Table 7: **Few-shot results.** Def. DETR is pretrained on ImageNet and finetuned on MS COCO train2014 with $k \in \{10, 30\}$ instances per class. Results reported on the novel classes of val2014. DETReg results reproduced in our codebase using the official checkpoint.

Method	Base Class Finetuning	Novel Class AP		Novel Class AP ₇₅	
		10	30	10	30
DETReg	✗	5.6	10.3	6.0	10.9
AptDet		10.3	14.5	10.9	15.1
DETReg	✓	9.9	15.3	10.9	16.4
AptDet		12.4	18.9	13.1	20.4

Table 8: **Object-centric vs Scene-centric pretraining.** AptDet is pretrained different datasets, finetuned on MS COCO train2017 and evaluated on val2017.

Detector Pretraining	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AR ¹⁰⁰
-	48.3	66.9	52.4	-
COCO	49.1	67.8	53.1	25.1
ImageNet	49.6	68.2	53.8	27.1
Open Images	49.4	67.9	53.9	25.5

Open Images. We additionally report class-unaware object localization performance in terms of Average Recall (AR). In all cases, our method improves over the baseline, including when we pretrain and finetune on the same dataset (COCO). We observe that ImageNet performs best, followed by Open Images and MS COCO, though we note that the margins between them are not very large. Combined, these findings show that: a) AptDet is highly sample efficient, achieving competitive performance even when pretraining with much more limited data (COCO), b) AptDet is flexible, being able to handle both object-centric and scene-centric data, and c) the properties of the pretraining dataset are impactful, with a larger object-centric dataset (i.e. ImageNet) leading to better performance relative to scene-centric (Open Images) and smaller (COCO) datasets. Table 8 provides further insight as to why ImageNet pretraining performs best. As seen by contrasting AR scores, ImageNet’s detector localizes more objects correctly. This indicates that the proposals generated for ImageNet are relatively better, which likely leads to better supervision, especially for self-training. Overall, these results indicate that AptDet does not require carefully curated object-centric data although both the size of the dataset and the level of curation have an impact on its performance.

Self-supervised representation learning from scratch: Experiments conducted in previous sections initialize the backbone with weights obtained by self-supervised training on ImageNet. In this section, we evaluate the representation learning capacity of AptDet by pretraining a ViDT+ detector from an *untrained* backbone (from scratch) to examine whether independent backbone pretraining is indeed necessary. We pretrain on object-centric (ImageNet) and scene-centric (COCO & Open Images) data and present results in Table 9. For completeness, we include results for other methods that focus on self-supervised backbone-only pretraining, noting that they use a different detector architecture during finetuning. Results again show that AptDet performs best with a well-curated, object-centric pretraining dataset, but is competitive even when trained on complex, scene-centric images. AptDet performs on par with backbone-only ImageNet pretraining (MoBY) when pretrained on COCO, and outperforms it when pretrained on Open Images. This outcome supports our thesis that unsupervised pretraining directly on scene-centric data with an object detection task is feasible and effective.

We further evaluate the quality of the COCO-pretrained backbone by performing a linear probe experiment on ImageNet. Table 10 shows AptDet’s performance as well as that of prior work. We note that prior work use a ResNet50 encoder, and thus a direct comparison is hard. It is however clear that our method is competitive, despite being pretrained for object detection, highlighting the natural fit of AptDet for general-purpose representation learning from scene-centric images.

6 Discussion

Performance: AptDet consistently outperforms previous works in unsupervised object detector pretraining by significant margins. Notably, in the main benchmark of this task (Table 2), relative to

Table 9: **Pretraining from scratch.** AptDet is pretrained *without backbone initialization*, finetuned on MS COCO train2017 and evaluated on val2017. For comparison, ViDT+ is finetuned with a MoBY backbone without pretraining.

Backbone Pretraining	Detector Pretraining	Detector	Pretraining Dataset	AP
MoBY	-		ImageNet	47.6
DetCon [11]	-	FCOS* [45]	ImageNet	48.4
Odin [19]	-		ImageNet	48.5
-	-		ImageNet	38.5
MoBY	-		ImageNet	48.3
-	AptDet	ViDT+	COCO	48.3
-	AptDet		Open Images	48.8
-	AptDet		ImageNet	49.2

Table 10: **Linear probing.** We pretrain AptDet with ViDT+ on MS COCO train2017, and apply the backbone to linear classification on ImageNet. Results for other methods are taken from [46].

Backbone Pretraining	Acc
DenseCL [14]	49.9
VirTex [47]	53.8
MoCo [48]	49.8
Van Gansbeke et al. [46]	56.1
AptDet	56.4

the baselines, AptDet increases the impact of pretraining over the previous state of the art by 100% for Cascade Mask R-CNN (+0.3 vs +0.6), 36% for Def. DETR (+1.1 vs +1.5) and 62% for ViDT+ (+0.8 vs +1.3). Furthermore, we expand on the typical benchmarks of detector pretraining and evaluate AptDet when pretraining entirely from scratch (Table 9), showing competitive results. Finally, we examine the impact of the pretraining dataset in terms of its size and level of curation (Table 8).

Complexity: A major strength of AptDet is its simplicity and efficiency. Unlike previous works that draw from contrastive learning, AptDet follows the typical pipeline of object detection training without complex auxiliary objectives. Furthermore, previous works [3, 6, 8, 7] use student-teacher architectures during training, which require multiple forward passes per sample and lead to complex pipelines. AptDet, on the other hand, requires only one forward pass, making it much more efficient in terms of training speed and memory requirements.

Unsupervised pretraining for object detectors: As mentioned in the introduction, previous works on unsupervised object detector pretraining largely focused on techniques developed for backbone-only self-supervised representation learning, and on adapting them to the detector pretraining task. AptDet represents a deviation from this approach, and achieves state-of-the-art results with a simple detection framework, relying on techniques developed for object detection. While AptDet is not orthogonal to previous works and could incorporate auxiliary objectives (e.g. based on contrastive learning), we hope our work will motivate research for the development of novel methods in this area that draw from object detection literature, in addition to self-supervised representation learning for backbone architectures.

Limitations: As stated previously, our work is, to the best of our knowledge, the first to consider unsupervised object detection as a pretext task for from-scratch pretraining of detector architectures, as an alternative to the two-stage scheme of backbone-only self-supervised pretraining followed by detector pretraining. Although AptDet achieves impressive results in this task, it still requires a pretrained self-supervised model for region proposal and pseudo-label extraction.

7 Conclusion

We have proposed AptDet, a novel method for self-supervised end-to-end object detector pretraining. Compared to prior work, our method aligns pretraining and downstream tasks through the careful construction of object proposals and pseudo-labels and the use of self-training. We extensively evaluate AptDet in several object detector pretraining benchmarks and demonstrate that it consistently outperforms previous methods across settings and detector architectures. However, unlike prior work, we show that AptDet is also capable of effectively pretraining the backbone. This brings our method in line with the wider literature on self-supervised representation learning for detection. We again show competitive performance in this area and explore novel settings, specifically pretraining with scene-centric datasets and even pretraining from scratch. Overall, we believe our framework not only outperforms existing detector pretraining methods but also represents a promising step toward self-supervised, fully end-to-end object detection pretraining on uncurated images.

References

- [1] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- [2] Zhigang Dai, Bolun Cai, Yugeng Lin, and Junying Chen. UP-DETR: Unsupervised pre-training for object detection with transformers. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [3] Amir Bar, Xin Wang, Vadim Kantorov, Colorado J Reed, Roei Herzig, Gal Chechik, Anna Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Amir Globerson. DETReg: Unsupervised pretraining with region priors for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [4] Xudong Wang, Rohit Girdhar, Stella X Yu, and Ishan Misra. Cut and learn for unsupervised object detection and instance segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [5] Jasper RR Uijlings, Koen EA Van De Sande, Theo Gevers, and Arnold WM Smeulders. Selective search for object recognition. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 104:154–171, 2013.
- [6] Yizhou Wang, Meilin Chen, Shixiang Tang, Feng Zhu, Haiyang Yang, Lei Bai, Rui Zhao, Yunfeng Yan, Donglian Qi, and Wanli Ouyang. Unsupervised object detection pretraining with joint object priors generation and detector learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:12435–12448, 2022.
- [7] Gengshi Huang, Wei Li, Jianing Teng, Kun Wang, Zeren Chen, Jing Shao, Chen Change Loy, and Lu Sheng. Siamese detr. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [8] Guoqiang Jin, Fan Yang, Mingshan Sun, Ruyi Zhao, Yakun Liu, Wei Li, Tianpeng Bao, Liwei Wu, Xingyu Zeng, and Rui Zhao. Seqco-detr: Sequence consistency training for self-supervised object detection with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08481*, 2023.
- [9] Ming Li, Jie Wu, Xionghui Wang, Chen Chen, Jie Qin, Xuefeng Xiao, Rui Wang, Min Zheng, and Xin Pan. Aligndet: Aligning pre-training and fine-tuning in object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11077*, 2023.
- [10] Zhenda Xie, Yutong Lin, Zheng Zhang, Yue Cao, Stephen Lin, and Han Hu. Propagate yourself: Exploring pixel-level consistency for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [11] Olivier J Hénaff, Skanda Koppula, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Aaron Van den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, and João Carreira. Efficient visual pretraining with contrastive detection. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [12] Fangyun Wei, Yue Gao, Zhirong Wu, Han Hu, and Stephen Lin. Aligning pretraining for detection via object-level contrastive learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22682–22694, 2021.
- [13] Wouter Van Gansbeke, Simon Vandenhende, Stamatios Georgoulis, and Luc V Gool. Revisiting contrastive methods for unsupervised learning of visual representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16238–16250, 2021.
- [14] Xinlong Wang, Rufeng Zhang, Chunhua Shen, Tao Kong, and Lei Li. Dense contrastive learning for self-supervised visual pre-training. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [15] Lang Huang, Shan You, Mingkai Zheng, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, and Toshihiko Yamasaki. Learning where to learn in cross-view self-supervised learning. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [16] Akash Gokul, Konstantinos Kallidromitis, Shufan Li, Yusuke Kato, Kazuki Kozuka, Trevor Darrell, and Colorado J Reed. Refine and represent: Region-to-object representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11821*, 2022.
- [17] Enze Xie, Jian Ding, Wenhai Wang, Xiaohang Zhan, Hang Xu, Peize Sun, Zhenguo Li, and Ping Luo. DetCo: Unsupervised contrastive learning for object detection. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [18] Xin Wen, Bingchen Zhao, Anlin Zheng, Xiangyu Zhang, and Xiaojuan Qi. Self-supervised visual representation learning with semantic grouping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16423–16438, 2022.

- [19] Olivier J. Hénaff, Skanda Koppula, Evan Shelhamer, Daniel Zoran, Andrew Jaegle, Andrew Zisserman, João Carreira, and Relja Arandjelović. Object discovery and representation networks. In *ECCV*, 2022.
- [20] Yutong Bai, Xinlei Chen, Alexander Kirillov, Alan Yuille, and Alexander C Berg. Point-level region contrast for object detection pre-training. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [21] Robin Karlsson, Tomoki Hayashi, Keisuke Fujii, Alexander Carballo, Kento Ohtani, and Kazuya Takeda. Vice: Improving dense representation learning by superpixelization and contrasting cluster assignment. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2111, 2021.
- [22] Ashraful Islam, Benjamin Lundell, Harpreet Sawhney, Sudipta N Sinha, Peter Morales, and Richard J Radke. Self-supervised learning with local contrastive loss for detection and semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 5624–5633, 2023.
- [23] Jian Ding, Enze Xie, Hang Xu, Chenhan Jiang, Zhenguo Li, Ping Luo, and Gui-Song Xia. Deeply unsupervised patch re-identification for pre-training object detectors. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022.
- [24] Zhaowen Li, Yousong Zhu, Fan Yang, Wei Li, Chaoyang Zhao, Yingying Chen, Zhiyang Chen, Jiahao Xie, Liwei Wu, Rui Zhao, et al. Univip: A unified framework for self-supervised visual pre-training. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [25] Jiahao Xie, Xiaohang Zhan, Ziwei Liu, Yew Soon Ong, and Chen Change Loy. Unsupervised object-level representation learning from scene images. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28864–28876, 2021.
- [26] Wouter Van Gansbeke, Simon Vandenhende, and Luc Van Gool. Discovering object masks with transformers for unsupervised semantic segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06363*, 2022.
- [27] Oriane Siméoni, Gilles Puy, Huy V Vo, Simon Roburin, Spyros Gidaris, Andrei Bursuc, Patrick Pérez, Renaud Marlet, and Jean Ponce. Localizing objects with self-supervised transformers and no labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14279*, 2021.
- [28] Yangtao Wang, Xi Shen, Yuan Yuan, Yuming Du, Maomao Li, Shell Xu Hu, James L Crowley, and Dominique Vaufreydaz. Tokencut: Segmenting objects in images and videos with self-supervised transformer and normalized cut. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00383*, 2022.
- [29] Oriane Siméoni, Chloé Sekkat, Gilles Puy, Antonin Vobecky, Éloi Zablocki, and Patrick Pérez. Unsupervised object localization: Observing the background to discover objects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.07834*, 2022.
- [30] Luke Melas-Kyriazi, Christian Rupprecht, Iro Laina, and Andrea Vedaldi. Deep spectral methods: A surprisingly strong baseline for unsupervised semantic segmentation and localization. In *CVPR*, pages 8364–8375, 2022.
- [31] Xinlong Wang, Zhiding Yu, Shalini De Mello, Jan Kautz, Anima Anandkumar, Chunhua Shen, and Jose M Alvarez. Freesolo: Learning to segment objects without annotations. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [32] Andrew Ng, Michael Jordan, and Yair Weiss. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14, 2001.
- [33] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2019.
- [34] Roman Solovyev, Weimin Wang, and Tatiana Gabruseva. Weighted boxes fusion: Ensembling boxes from different object detection models. *Image and Vision Computing*, 107:104117, 2021.
- [35] Xizhou Zhu, Weijie Su, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Xiaogang Wang, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable DETR: Deformable transformers for end-to-end object detection. *ICLR*, 2021.

- [36] Hwanjun Song, Deqing Sun, Sanghyuk Chun, Varun Jampani, Dongyoon Han, Byeongho Heo, Wonjae Kim, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. An extendable, efficient and effective transformer-based object detector. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07962*, 2022.
- [37] Kaiming He, Georgia Gkioxari, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Mask R-CNN. In *ICCV*, 2017.
- [38] Zhaowei Cai and Nuno Vasconcelos. Cascade R-CNN: Delving into high quality object detection. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [39] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [40] Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9912–9924, 2020.
- [41] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [42] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [43] Zhenda Xie, Yutong Lin, Zhuliang Yao, Zheng Zhang, Qi Dai, Yue Cao, and Han Hu. Self-supervised learning with swin transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04553*, 2021.
- [44] Xinlong Wang, Rufeng Zhang, Tao Kong, Lei Li, and Chunhua Shen. Solov2: Dynamic and fast instance segmentation. *Advances in Neural information processing systems*, 33:17721–17732, 2020.
- [45] Zhi Tian, Chunhua Shen, Hao Chen, and Tong He. FCOS: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection. In *ICCV*, 2019.
- [46] Wouter Van Gansbeke, Simon Vandenhende, Stamatios Georgoulis, and Luc V Gool. Revisiting contrastive methods for unsupervised learning of visual representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [47] Karan Desai and Justin Johnson. Virtex: Learning visual representations from textual annotations. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [48] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [49] Xin Wang, Thomas E Huang, Trevor Darrell, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Fisher Yu. Frustratingly simple few-shot object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06957*, 2020.
- [50] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Fei-Fei Li. ImageNet large scale visual recognition challenge. *IJCV*, 2015.
- [51] Ivan Krasin, Tom Duerig, Neil Alldrin, Vittorio Ferrari, Sami Abu-El-Haija, Alina Kuznetsova, Hassan Rom, Jasper Uijlings, Stefan Popov, Shahab Kamali, Matteo Mallocci, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Andreas Veit, Serge Belongie, Victor Gomes, Abhinav Gupta, Chen Sun, Gal Chechik, David Cai, Zheyun Feng, Dhyanesh Narayanan, and Kevin Murphy. Openimages: A public dataset for large-scale multi-label and multi-class image classification. *Dataset available from <https://storage.googleapis.com/openimages/web/index.html>*, 2017.
- [52] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014.
- [53] Mark Everingham, Luc Van Gool, Christopher KI Williams, John Winn, and Andrew Zisserman. The pascal visual object classes (voc) challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 88: 303–338, 2010.

- [54] Debidatta Dwibedi, Ishan Misra, and Martial Hebert. Cut, paste and learn: Surprisingly easy synthesis for instance detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1301–1310, 2017.
- [55] Alexey Bochkovskiy, Chien-Yao Wang, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*, 2020.

A Training Hyperparameters

We provide here detailed hyperparameters for all training settings included in the main paper. Note however that, for pre-training and fine-tuning, we follow the recipes of the original works. We therefore **perform no hyperparameter tuning**. This highlights a positive feature of AptDet: transferability. As AptDet’s training objective is straightforward (pseudo-)class aware detection, which is already what detectors are typically designed for, it can be adapted to any detector architecture with minimal effort. The specific hyperparameters for each architecture are presented below:

Def. DETR: We follow [3] and pretrain for 5 epochs per stage on ImageNet with a batch size of 192 and a fixed learning rate of 0.0002. For finetuning, we train on COCO for 50 epochs and PASCAL VOC for 100 epochs, with a batch size of 32. The learning rate is set to 0.0002, and is decreased by a factor of 10 at epoch 40 and 100 for COCO and PASCAL VOC respectively.

ViDT+: We use the training hyperparameters proposed in [36]. Specifically, unless stated otherwise, ViDT+ is pretrained for 10 epochs per stage on ImageNet and Open Images, and for 50 epochs per stage on COCO, with batch size 128. In all cases, the learning rate is set to 0.0001 and follows a cosine decay schedule.

Cascade Mask R-CNN: We use the pretraining and fine-tuning hyperparameters proposed in [4]. Specifically, unless stated otherwise, Cascade Mask R-CNN is pretrained for 160,000 steps per stage on ImageNet with batch size 16. The learning rate is set to 0.01 and decreased by a factor of 10 at after 80,000 training steps.

Mask R-CNN: We use the pretraining and fine-tuning hyperparameters proposed in [4]. This experiment is designed to enable a direct comparison with AlignDet [9] *under the AlignDet setting*. We note however that it involves limited pretraining (12 epochs) on a small dataset (MS COCO) with a shallow detector architecture (Mask R-CNN), each of these being a disadvantageous regime for AptDet, which was designed for pretraining on large datasets with the goal of learning strong representations through object detection. Accordingly, we modify our approach **only for this setting** by a) freezing the backbone (due to the combination of shallow detector, low data regime, and short schedule), and b) avoiding self-training (to restrict training to 12 epochs to match AlignDet). Even with this setting, which plays against the strengths of AptDet, we outperform AlignDet by a significant margin, demonstrating the effectiveness of our proposed aligned pretext task.

Unless stated otherwise, we pretrain with 2048 pseudo-classes (i.e. we set the number of clusters for the global clustering step to 2048), and apply one round of self-training, following our findings in Table 16.

For experiments other than the full setting (i.e. semi-supervised, few-shot, and self-supervised representation learning), we apply the following changes to the training parameters described above:

Semi-supervised: For Def. DETR we follow DETReg [3] and finetune on COCO for 2,000 epochs for 1% of samples annotated, 1,000 epochs for 2% of samples, 500 epochs for 5% of samples, and 400 epochs for 10% of samples. The learning rate is kept fixed at 0.0002. Results in Table 3 are measured over 5 runs, with different, randomly sampled annotated samples. For Cascade Mask R-CNN, we closely follow the training setting and evaluation protocol used in [4].

Few-shot: We finetune on COCO’s base classes using the splits proposed in [49]. For the standard few-shot setting we a) finetune on the base classes following the COCO finetuning settings outlined above, and b) finetune on the 10- and 30-shot sets for 30 and 50 epochs respectively, with a fixed learning rate of 0.0002 and 0.00004. For the extreme setting, we directly finetune on the 10- and 30-shot sets for 400 epochs with a learning rate of 0.0002 which is decreased by a factor of 10 after 320 epochs. Results in Table 4 correspond to the best validation score of each run during training, averaged over 5 runs, with k-shot samples corresponding to seeds 1-5 of [49]. When finetuning on the k-shot instances, the backbone is kept frozen in both settings.

Self-supervised representation learning on scene-centric data: For these experiments, where the entire architecture is initialized from scratch (backbone & detector), we train for 1,000 epochs on COCO, 100 epochs on ImageNet, and 70 epochs on Open Images. This allows for a fair comparison, with approximately the same number of training steps across datasets.

Table 11: Results of "extreme" few-shot training for 50 epochs and 400 epochs.

Method	Epochs	Novel Class AP		Novel Class AP ₇₅	
		10	30	10	30
DETReg	50	1.9	3.4	1.8	3.52
AptDet		8.32	13.9	8.06	14.4
DETReg	400	5.6	10.3	6.0	10.9
AptDet		10.3	14.5	10.9	15.1

B Datasets

We use the training sets of ImageNet [50], Open Images [51] and MS COCO [52] for unsupervised pretraining. For supervised finetuning we use the training sets of MS COCO and PASCAL VOC [53]. Results are reported for the corresponding validation sets, using Average Precision (AP) and Average Recall (AR). ImageNet includes 1.2M object-centric images, classified with 1,000 labels and without object-level annotations. Open Images includes 1.7M scene-centric images and a total of 14.6M bounding boxes with 600 object classes. COCO is a scene-centric dataset with 120K training images and 5K validation images containing 80 classes. PASCAL VOC is scene-centric and contains 20K images with object annotations covering 21 classes.

C Algorithm

In this section, we present AptDet as an algorithm.

Algorithm 1 AptDet Pretraining

Require: $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^I$, Net $g = (g_b, g_h)$, initial params. Θ_0

- 1: ▷ Unsup. train set gen. (Section 3.1)
- 2: **for** $i = 1 : N$ **do**
- 3: $F_l \leftarrow g_b(X_i)$
- 4: $M_i \leftarrow \bigcup \text{Cluster}(F_l, K)$ ▷ $K \in \mathcal{K}, l \in \mathcal{L}$
- 5: $\mathbb{R}_i \leftarrow \text{Connected Components}(M_i)$
- 6: $\{b_n^i, f_n^i\}_{N(i)} \leftarrow \text{Filter}(\mathbb{R}_i)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: $\{c_n^i\} \leftarrow \text{K-Means}(\{f_n^i\}, K = C)$ ▷ Pseudo-classes
- 9: $\mathcal{T}_0 \leftarrow \left\{ X_i, \{(b_n, c_n)\}_{n=1}^{N(i)} \right\}_{i=1}^I$
- 10: ▷ Self-training (Section 3.2)
- 11: **for** j stages **do**
- 12: $g(-; \Theta_{j+1}) \leftarrow \text{Train}(\mathcal{T}_j, g)$ ▷ Using eq. 2
- 13: $\mathcal{T}_{j+1} \leftarrow \text{Filter}(\{g(X_i; \Theta_j)\}_{i=1}^I)$
- 14: **end for**

D Convergence & Alignment Analysis

In this section, we discuss the convergence and alignment properties of AptDet by analyzing the results of the "extreme" few-shot experiments. As discussed in paper Sec. 5, in this setting we pretrain Def. DETR on ImageNet, and then finetune directly on COCO train2014, using $k \in \{10, 30\}$ instances from all classes.

In Figs. 3 and 4 we present the AP scores for AptDet and DETReg during training, averaged over 5 runs, and measured over the validation set’s novel classes. As was noted in paper Sec. 5, AptDet outperforms DETReg by large margins. Notably, however, it is also shown to converge much faster. More specifically, in Table 11 we present results for 50 epochs of k-shot finetuning against the performance reached after 400 epochs. In both cases, we average the best validation score across 5 runs. We see that, at 50 epochs, AptDet has already reached near-peak performance, while DETReg converges at a much slower rate.




Figure 3: AP scores on COCO’s va12014 novel classes during finetuning with $k=10$ instances per class. Results averaged over 5 runs.




Figure 4: AP scores on COCO’s va12014 novel classes during finetuning with $k=30$ instances per class. Results averaged over 5 runs.

This means AptDet effectively alleviates the sample inefficiency and slow convergence of DETR architectures and makes our method particularly useful when annotations and/or computational resources are extremely scarce. These results provide further support for our conclusions in paper Sec. 5, namely that AptDet is much better aligned with the downstream task, with learned object representations that are well suited for class-aware object detection, so that minimal training and supervision can lead to strong performance.

E Analysis and ablations

Throughout this section we use ViDT+ and, unless stated otherwise, pretrain on ImageNet for 10 epochs per stage.

Impact of object proposals: We evaluate our object proposal method in two ways: a) we examine how well it localizes objects by computing the Average Recall (AR) score on COCO va12017 (see Table 12), and b) we investigate its impact on AptDet by replacing it with Selective Search and present the outcomes (see Table 13).

Table 12 includes results both for our initial proposals (noted as AptDet-St. 0), and the proposals generated by pretrained detectors. Results show that our approach is superior to Selective Search and that detector pretraining significantly improves over our initial proposals, supporting our decision to self-train. We observe also that our framework leads to better localization results than DETReg. Most interestingly, we observe that CutLER performs better in terms of localization than AptDet, even though AptDet consistently outperforms CutLER in terms of object detection pretraining. This reinforces our claim in paper Sec. 2, that unsupervised localization methods generate annotations and follow training processes that are not necessarily good for detector pretraining.

In Table 13 we find that using Selective Search proposals, AptDet still outperforms the MoBY baseline, but we observe a performance drop relative to our object proposal method. We attribute

Table 12: **Quality of proposals:** AR results on COCO val2017. The first section presents results for the initial extraction of object proposals, while the lower two sections present results for proposals generated by detection/segmentation architectures trained on the initial proposals.

Object proposals	Detection Architecture	AR ¹⁰⁰
Sel. Search	-	10.9
AptDet-St. 0	-	13.4
DETReg		21.5
AptDet-St. 1	ViDT+	25.9
AptDet-St. 2		27.1
CutLER		32.7
AptDet-St. 1	Cascade Mask R-CNN	24.5
AptDet-St. 2		24.6

Table 13: **Impact of initial proposals:** AP results on COCO val2017, using different initial object proposal methods.

Method	Proposals	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅
MoBY	-	48.3	66.9	52.4
AptDet-St. 1	Sel. Search	48.7	67.3	52.7
AptDet-St. 2		48.6	67.1	52.2
AptDet-St. 1	Our Anns.	48.9	67.4	52.9
AptDet-St. 2		49.6	68.2	53.8

this to two reasons: a) our method likely produces more discriminative descriptors f by aggregating representations over a mask of semantically related pixels, rather than over a box, which is the case for Selective Search. This, in turn, leads to better pseudo-labels. b) Our proposals are more robust (see Table 12), and therefore provide better supervision. In summary, we conclude that AptDet is robust to different object proposal methods, but greatly benefits from an appropriate method choice.

Number of classes: We ablate the number of pseudo-classes produced by the global clustering of object proposals. For this set of experiments, we pretrain and finetune on COCO train2017 for 25 epochs each. Note this is a simplified (and cheaper) setting for the purpose of ablating. We find that, during pretraining, increasing the number of clusters/pseudo-labels leads to decreased training accuracy (ACC) and class-unaware AR (measured on the validation set), which is expected, since increasing the number of classes makes the task harder. However, the AP score after finetuning increases, indicating that the pretrained detector is more powerful. Overall, results indicate that our method is fairly robust to the number of pseudo-labels chosen. We do not increase the number of classes beyond 2048 as training becomes less stable and more computationally expensive.

Self-training stages: We examine the impact of self-training in Table 16, and find that it produces meaningful gains. We explore additional self-training with ViDT+ [36], but observe no benefits, and therefore limit self-training to one round throughout the paper.

Schedule length: In Table 17 we examine the impact of a longer training schedule on our method for both training stages by extending training from 10 to 25 epochs per stage. The results show that a longer training schedule can have some benefits, albeit marginal. Interestingly, Table 17 highlights the importance of self-training, as two training stages totaling a combined 20 epochs (10 per stage) clearly outperform a single training round of 25 epochs.

Time & VRAM requirements: We present in Table 15 runtimes and VRAM usage for AptDet and DETReg [3], for pretraining on ImageNet using a ViDT+ detector. We note here that DETReg is among the most efficient methods in the relevant literature [7]. As seen in Table 15, AptDet requires slightly more GPU memory than DETReg, which is to be expected given that AptDet trains the backbone as well as the detector. However, despite training more parameters and using more

Table 14: **Number of classes.** Pretraining and finetuning on COCO, evaluation in terms of training accuracy, AR of the pretrained detector, and AP of the finetuned model. 1 class implies class-unaware pretraining.

Classes	ACC	AR	AP
1	-	25.2	41.2
256	80.01	23.9	43.8
512	75.13	24.0	43.9
2048	53.75	23.9	44.1

	DETReg	AptDet
Training time (h)	164	165
Avg. proposals per img.	28	36 / 53
Memory usage per GPU (GB)	55.6	73.6

Table 15: Runtimes on ImageNet with ViDT+ and 8 V100 GPUs. For AptDet, we present the avg. proposals per image for both stages (stage 1/stage 2).

proposals AptDet has the same training time as DETReg. This demonstrates the increased training efficiency of AptDet’s class-aware detection framework compared with the contrastive student-teacher pipelines utilized by most previous works on this subject [9, 3, 7, 6].

Regarding the proposal extraction processes, extracting the initial proposals \mathcal{T}_0 is a CPU-intensive process that, in our hardware, requires 24 hours for ImageNet. The subsequent proposals \mathcal{T}_1 used for self-training are acquired through straightforward inference with the pretrained detector, and require approximately 2 hours to extract.

Impact of augmentations: Unlike most previous works, AptDet does not use contrastive learning. Therefore we do not use the color and cropping augmentations that are standard in contrastive learning. Since our task is better aligned with detection, we use mosaic [55] transforms, a standard object detection augmentation. We evaluate the impact of this choice in Table 18 with a Cascade Mask R-CNN detector. While using augmentations helps, we observe that even *without augmentations*, AptDet achieves state-of-the-art performance. These findings provide strong evidence that the core performance differentiator is our framework.

Table 16: **Self-training rounds.** AP results for ViDT+ pretrained with AptDet on ImageNet and finetuned on COCO. Avg. proposals per image are measured during training.

Detector	Stage	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅
ViDT+ [36]	1	48.9	67.4	52.9
	2	49.6	68.2	53.8
	3	49.6	68.0	53.9
Def. DETR [35]	1	46.1	64.6	50.3
	2	46.7	65.4	50.9

Table 17: **Scheduler length.** AP results for varying training epochs. 10 and 25 epoch Stage 2 models are initialized from 10 and 25 epoch Stage 1 models respectively.

Stage	Epochs	AP	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅
1	10	48.9	67.4	52.9
1	25	49.2	67.7	53.6
2	10	49.6	68.2	53.8
2	25	49.7	68.1	54.2

Table 18: **Data augmentations.** AptDet’s performance with/without mosaic transforms, pretrained on ImageNet and evaluated on MS COCO.

Method	Augmentations	AP
CutLER [4]	Copy-paste [54]	44.7
AptDet	X	44.8
AptDet	Mosaic [55]	45.0

F Visualization

In Fig. 5 we provide examples visual examples of bounding boxes produced by Selective Search, our pseudo-labeled object proposal method, and AptDet, specifically a ViDT+ detector trained for two stages on ImageNet. To avoid clutter, for all three methods we only include objects whose predicted bounding boxes have an IOU higher than 0.5 with an object in the ground truth set.

The images illustrate that self-training significantly improves the object discovery performance of AptDet over the original region proposals. Notably, those include much smaller items, and much better performance in cluttered scenes. As stated in the main paper, this contributes to the performance of our framework and specifically the performance gains between stages.




Figure 5: Examples of object proposals extracted from AptDet, contrasted with the ground truth, Selective Search and our initial pseudo-labeled object proposals, extracted as described in paper Sec. 3.1. The images belong to COCO train2017. To avoid clutter, we only show predicted objects whose bounding boxes have an IOU greater than 0.5 with at least one ground truth object. Best seen in color.