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Abstract
Hashing has been widely used for approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search in big data applications because of its low storage cost and fast retrieval speed. The goal of hashing is to map the data points from the original space into a binary-code space where the similarity (neighborhood structure) in the original space is preserved. By directly exploiting the similarity to guide the hashing code learning procedure, graph hashing has attracted much attention. However, most existing graph hashing methods cannot achieve satisfactory performance in real applications due to the high complexity for graph modeling. In this paper, we propose a novel method, called scalable graph hashing with feature transformation (SGH), for large-scale graph hashing. Through feature transformation, we can effectively approximate the whole graph without explicitly computing the similarity graph matrix, based on which a sequential learning method is proposed to learn the hash functions in a bit-wise manner. Experiments on two datasets with one million data points show that our SGH method can outperform the state-of-the-art methods in terms of both accuracy and scalability.

1 Introduction
Nearest neighbor search [Andoni, 2009] plays an important role in a large variety of areas including machine learning, data mining, and information retrieval, and so on. In big data applications, it is typically time-consuming or impossible to return the exact nearest neighbors to the given queries. In fact, approximate nearest neighbors (ANN) [Indyk and Motwani, 1998; Andoni and Indyk, 2008] are enough to achieve satisfactory performance in many applications, such as the image retrieval task in search engines. Furthermore, ANN search is usually more efficient than exact nearest neighbor search to solve large-scale problems. Hence, ANN search has attracted more and more attention in this big data era [Andoni and Indyk, 2008].

Because of its low storage cost and fast retrieval speed, hashing [Andoni and Indyk, 2008; Wang et al., 2010a; Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Zhen and Yeung, 2012; Zhu et al., 2013; Song et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2014] has been widely used for ANN search. The hashing techniques used for ANN search are usually called similarity-preserving hashing, which tries to map the data points from the original space into a binary-code Hamming space where the similarity (neighborhood structure) in the original space is preserved. More specifically, the Hamming distance between the binary codes of two points should be small if these two points are similar in the original space. Otherwise, the Hamming distance should be as large as possible. With the binary-code representation, hashing can achieve constant or sub-linear time complexity for ANN search [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Zhang et al., 2014]. Furthermore, hashing can also reduce the storage cost dramatically. For example, only 4GB memory is needed to store one billion data points if each point is represented as a binary code of 32 bits. Hence, hashing has become one of the most popular methods for ANN search [Gionis et al., 1999; Datar et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 2008; Kulis and Darrell, 2009; Wang et al., 2010b; Liu et al., 2011; Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Kong and Li, 2012; Liu et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2014].

Compared with traditional data-independent hashing methods like locality sensitive hashing (LSH) [Gionis et al., 1999; Datar et al., 2004] which do not use any data for training, data-dependent hashing methods, which are also called learning to hash (LH) methods, can achieve comparable or better accuracy with shorter codes by learning hash functions from training data [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2014]. Hence, LH methods have become more popular than data-independent methods [Wang et al., 2010b; Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2014].

Existing LH methods can be divided into two main categories [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014]: unsupervised hashing and supervised hashing methods. Unsupervised hashing tries to preserve the Euclidean similarity between the attributes of training points, while supervised hashing [Norouzi and Fleet, 2011; Zhang et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2014] tries to preserve the semantic similarity constructed from the semantic labels of the training points. Although supervised hashing methods have demonstrated promising performance in some applications with se-
mismatic labels, it is time-consuming or impossible to get semantic labels in many real applications. Hence, we can only perform unsupervised hashing for these cases, which is also the focus of this paper.

Representative unsupervised hashing methods include spectral hashing (SH) [Weiss et al., 2008], binary reconstructive embeddings (BRE) [Kulis and Darrell, 2009], principal component analysis based hashing (PCAH) [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011], iterative quantization (IQ) [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011], anchor graph hashing (AGH) [Liu et al., 2011], isotropic hashing (IsoHash) [Kong and Li, 2012], and discrete graph hashing (DGH) [Liu et al., 2014]. Among these methods, SH, BRE, AGH and DGH are graph hashing methods. By directly exploiting the similarity (neighborhood structure) to guide the hashing code learning procedure, the objective of graph hashing exactly matches the goal of similarity-preserving hashing. Hence, graph hashing should be expected to achieve better performance than other non-graph based hashing methods if the learning algorithms are effective enough.

However, most existing graph hashing methods cannot achieve satisfactory performance in real applications due to the high complexity for graph modeling. More specifically, the similarity typically reflects the pairwise relationship between two points. The memory cost for storing all the pairwise similarities is \(O(n^2)\), where \(n\) is the number of training points. The time complexity for directly computing all the pairwise similarities is also \(O(n^2)\). Besides these costs to compute and store the similarity graph, almost all methods will introduce extra computation and memory cost during the learning procedure. Hence, it is memory-consuming and time-consuming or even intractable to learn from the whole similarity graph for large-scale datasets which are typical in hashing applications. Existing methods have to adopt approximation or subsampling methods for graph hashing on large-scale datasets. For example, SH uses an eigenfunction solution of 1-D Laplacian for approximation by assuming uniform data distribution, which actually loses the neighborhood structure in the data. BRE has to subsample a small subset for training even if a large-scale dataset is available. Both SH and BRE cannot achieve satisfactory performance in real applications, which has been verified by existing work [Liu et al., 2011]. Both AGH and DGH use anchor graphs to approximate the similarity graph, which successfully avoid the \(O(n^2)\) complexity for both memory and computation cost. However, the accuracy of approximation cannot be guaranteed, which might deteriorate the accuracy of the learned codes. Furthermore, it need extra computation cost to construct the anchors, which will be proved to be time-consuming in our experiment. Hence, although the objective is attractive, existing graph hashing methods cannot achieve satisfactory performance in real applications.

In this paper, we propose a novel method, called scalable graph hashing with feature transformation (SGH), for large-scale graph hashing. The main contributions of SGH are briefly outlined as follows:

- Inspired by the asymmetric LSH (ALSH) [Shrivastava and Li, 2014], SGH adopts a feature transformation method to effectively approximate the whole graph with- out explicitly computing the pairwise similarity graph matrix. Hence, the \(O(n^2)\) computation cost and storage cost are avoided in SGH, which makes SGH suitable for large-scale applications.

- A sequential learning method is proposed to learn the hash functions in a bit-wise manner, which is effective because the residual caused by former bits can be complementarily captured in the following bits.

- Experiments on two datasets with one million data points show that our SGH method can outperform the state-of-the-art methods in terms of both accuracy and scalability.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the problem definition of this paper. We present our SGH method in Section 3. Experiments are shown in Section 4, and finally we conclude the whole paper in Section 5.

2 Problem Definition

2.1 Notation

We use boldface lowercase letters like \(v\) to denote vectors, and the \(i\)th element of \(v\) is denoted as \(v_i\). Boldface uppercase letters like \(V\) denote matrices. The \(i\)th row of \(V\) is denoted as \(V_{i,:}\), the \(j\)th column of \(V\) is denoted as \(V_{:j}\), and the \((i, j)\)th element in \(V\) is denoted as \(V_{ij}\). \(V^T\) is the transpose of \(V\), and \(\text{tr}(V)\) is the trace of matrix \(V\). \(\|V\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} V_{ij}^2}\) is the Frobenius norm, which can also be used to define the length of a vector. \(\text{sgn}(\cdot)\) is an element-wise sign function. \([u; v]\) denotes the concatenation of two vectors \(u\) and \(v\). \(I_d\) is an identity matrix with dimensionality \(d\).

2.2 Graph Hashing

Assume we are given \(n\) data points \(X = [x_1; x_2; \ldots; x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}\), where \(d\) is the dimensionality of the data points and \(X_{i,:} = x_i^T\). Without loss of generality, the data are assumed to be zero centered which means \(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0\). Hashing is to map each point \(x_i\) into a binary code \(b_i \in \{-1, +1\}^c\), where \(c\) denotes the code size (length). In general, we use \(c\) binary hash functions \(\{h_k(\cdot)\}_{k=1}^c \in \{-1, +1\}^c\) to compute the binary code of \(x_i\), i.e., \(b_i = [h_1(x_i), h_2(x_i), \ldots, h_c(x_i)]^T\).

We have different metrics to measure the similarity between two points in the original space. Let \(S_{ij}\) denote the similarity between \(x_i\) and \(x_j\). One most widely used metric is defined as: \(S_{ij} = e^{-\frac{\|x_i - x_j\|^2}{\gamma}}\), where \(\gamma > 0\) is a parameter. We can find that \(S_{ij} \in [0, 1]\). Hashing need to preserve the similarity in the original feature space. More specifically, the larger the similarity between \(x_i\) and \(x_j\), the smaller the Hamming distance between \(b_i\) and \(b_j\) will be. In other words, for any three points \(x_i, x_j, x_k\), if \(S_{ij} < S_{ik}\), the Hamming distance between \(b_k\) and \(b_i\) should be smaller than that between \(b_j\) and \(b_i\).

If we compute all the pairwise similarities between any two points in \(X\), we can get a similarity graph with the graph matrix \(S = [S_{ij}]_{n \times n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\). Graph hashing tries to use all the information or part of the information in \(S\) to learn the binary codes. It’s obvious that both the time complexity and storage...
complexity are $O(n^2)$ if we explicitly compute all the pairwise similarities in $S$, which is not acceptable in large-scale applications. Hence, as stated in the introduction, existing methods have to adopt approximation or subsampling techniques to solve it. However, they cannot achieve satisfactory performance, which motivates the work in this paper.

3 Scalable Graph Hashing with Feature Transformation

In this section, we present the details of our graph hashing method SGH, including the model, learning algorithm, and complexity analysis.

3.1 Model

The model of SGH contains two key components: the objective function and the feature transformation method.

Objective Function

The aim of SGH is to approximate the similarity matrix $S$ by the learned hashing codes, which results in the following objective function:

$$\min_{\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\tilde{S}_{ij} - \frac{1}{c} b_i^T b_j)^2,$$

where $\tilde{S}_{ij} = 2S_{ij} - 1$. Note that $\tilde{S}_{ij} \in (-1, 1]$, and the relative distance in $S$ is kept in $\tilde{S}$. We use $\tilde{S}$ in the objective function to keep consistent with the range of $\frac{1}{c} b_i^T b_j \in [-1, 1]$.

It is NP-hard to directly learn the binary codes $\{b_i\}$ in (1). As in kernelized locality-sensitive hashing (KLSH) [Kulis and Grauman, 2009] and supervised hashing with kernels (KSH) [Liu et al., 2012], we define the hash function for the $k$th bit of $b_i$ as follows:

$$h_k(x_i) = \text{sgn} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m W_{kj} \phi(x_i, x_j) + \text{bias}_k \right),$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times m}$ is the weight matrix, $\phi(x_i, x_j)$ is a kernel function which is a RBF (Gaussian) function in our experiment, $m$ denotes the number of kernel bases, and $\text{bias}_k$ is a bias value. Our goal is to learn $H(x) = \{h_1(x), \ldots, h_c(x)\}$ to map the whole training set $X$ to a binary matrix $B \in \{-1, 1\}^{n \times c}$ with $B_{ij} = b_i^T$. $\text{bias}_k$ is typically set to $-\frac{1}{c} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m W_{kj} \phi(x_i, x_j)$, which has the same effect as that by making the training data in the kernel space zero-centered. In fact, the above hash function can be rewritten as $\tilde{h}_k(x) = \text{sgn}(K(x)w_k)$, where $w_k = W_k^T$ and $K(x) = [\phi(x, x_1), \ldots, \phi(x, x_n)]$. Then, by substituting the $H(x)$ into (1), we can get the objective function with the parameter $W$ to learn:

$$\min_W \| \tilde{S} - \text{sgn}(K(X)W^T) \text{sgn}(K(X)W^T)^T \|_F^2,$$  

where $K(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the kernel feature matrix for all training points in $X$.

Feature Transformation

As stated in Section 2, both time complexity and storage complexity are $O(n^2)$ if we explicitly compute all the pairwise similarities in $S$, which is obviously unscalable. Here, we propose a feature transformation method to use all the similarities without explicitly computing $S$.

We first define $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ as follows:

$$P(x) = \left\lceil \frac{2c^2 - 1}{e\rho} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}} x, \sqrt{\frac{c^2 + 1}{e} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}}} ; 1 \right\rceil,$$

$$Q(x) = \left\lceil \frac{2c^2 - 1}{e\rho} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}} x, \sqrt{\frac{c^2 + 1}{e} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}}} ; -1 \right\rceil,$$

where we multiply a value $\sqrt{\frac{2c^2 - 1}{e\rho} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}}}$ to $x$, and then add two extra dimensions.

Then we can get:

$$P(x)^T Q(x) = \left\lceil \frac{2c^2 - 1}{2e} x + \frac{c^2 + 1}{2e} \right\rceil e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\rho}} = 1$$

Here, we use an approximation $\frac{c^2 - 1}{2e} x + \frac{c^2 + 1}{2e} \approx e^x$, which is shown in Figure 1 when $x \in [-1, 1]$. We can find that these two functions are close to each other with $x \in [-1, 1]$. Hence, to make the approximation reasonable, we assume $-1 \leq \frac{2}{\rho} x_i^T x_j \leq 1$. It is easy to prove that

$$\rho = \max_{i=1}^n \| x_i \|^2 \phi(x_i, x_j) \in [-1, 1].$$

Actually, $\max_{i=1}^n \| x_i \|^2 / \rho$ is not a tight bound of $\rho$. In real applications, we can also treat $\rho$ as a hyper-parameter, and tune it with cross-validation techniques.

By using this simple feature transformation, we can derive the similarity matrix $S = P(X)^T Q(X)$, where $P(X) = \{P(x_1), \ldots, P(x_n)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+2) \times n}$ and $Q(X) = \{Q(x_1), \ldots, Q(x_n)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+2) \times n}$. Both the time and storage complexities are $O(n^2)$ if we explicitly computing $S = P(X)^T Q(X)$ even if the feature transformation is adopted. However, we use only $P(X)$ and $Q(X)$ for computation, but do not explicitly computing $S$ in our follow-
ing learning algorithm. Hence, the $O(n^2)$ complexity can be avoided in our method.

Please note that the feature transformation is inspired by ALSH [Shrivastava and Li, 2014], which is proposed for maximum inner product search with data-independent hashing. Different from ALSH, our SGH is for data-dependent hashing. Furthermore, the feature transformation method in SGH is different from that in ALSH.

### 3.2 Learning

The discrete $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ function in (2) makes the problem very difficult to solve. One possible solution is to discard the discrete constraints and relax the whole $H(\cdot)$ function to a real-valued function, which has been adopted by many methods such as SH [Weiss et al., 2008] and AGH [Liu et al., 2011]. However, this relaxation procedure may lead to poor performance, which has been verified by existing work [Kong and Li, 2012, Zhang and Li, 2014]. Here, we design a sequential learning strategy in a bit-wise manner, where the residual caused by former bits can be complementarily captured in the following bits [Liu et al., 2012; Zhang and Li, 2014].

Assuming that we have already learned $t - 1$ bits which are parameterized by $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{t-1}$, the residual matrix to reconstruct the similarity matrix can be computed as follows:

$$R_t = c\tilde{S} - \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \text{sgn}(K(X)w_i)\text{sgn}(K(X)w_i)^T. \tag{4}$$

Then our objective function to learn the $t$th bit can be written as follows:

$$\min_{w_t} \|R_t - \text{sgn}(K(X)w_t)\text{sgn}(K(X)w_t)^T\|_F^2 \tag{5}$$

The objective function in (5) is still an NP-hard problem due to the $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ function. In order to solve the problem in (5), we apply spectral relaxation [Weiss et al., 2008] and impose an orthogonality constraint to get the following formulation:

$$\min_{w_t} \|R_t - K(X)w_tK(X)^T\|_F^2 \tag{6}$$

s.t. $w_t^TK(X)^TK(X)w_t = 1$

The problem in (6) can be further simplified to:

$$\|R_t - K(X)w_tK(X)^T\|_F^2$$

$$\begin{align*}
&= \text{tr}\{R_t - K(X)w_tK(X)^T\}^2
&= \text{tr}\{K(X)w_tK(X)^T\}^2
&= 2\text{tr}(w_t^TK(X)^TR_tK(X)) + \text{tr}(R_tR_t^T)
&= -2\text{tr}(w_t^TK(X)^TK(X)w_t) + \text{const}.
\end{align*}$$

Then we reformulate the problem in (6) as follows:

$$\min_{w_t} -\text{tr}(w_t^TK(X)^TR_tK(X)w_t) \tag{7}$$

s.t. $w_t^TK(X)^TK(X)w_t = 1$

Then we can obtain a generalized eigenvalue problem as follows:

$$K(X)^TR_tK(X)w_t = \lambda K(X)^TK(X)w_t.$$
Table 1: Top-1000 precision on TINY-1M and MIRFLICKR-1M. The best accuracy is shown in boldface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>32 bits</th>
<th>64 bits</th>
<th>96 bits</th>
<th>128 bits</th>
<th>256 bits</th>
<th>32 bits</th>
<th>64 bits</th>
<th>96 bits</th>
<th>128 bits</th>
<th>256 bits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGH</td>
<td>0.4697</td>
<td>0.5742</td>
<td>0.6299</td>
<td>0.6737</td>
<td>0.7357</td>
<td>0.4919</td>
<td>0.6041</td>
<td>0.6677</td>
<td>0.6985</td>
<td>0.7584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITQ</td>
<td>0.4289</td>
<td>0.4782</td>
<td>0.4947</td>
<td>0.4986</td>
<td>0.5003</td>
<td>0.5177</td>
<td>0.5776</td>
<td>0.5999</td>
<td>0.6096</td>
<td>0.6228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGH</td>
<td>0.3973</td>
<td>0.4402</td>
<td>0.4577</td>
<td>0.4654</td>
<td>0.4767</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>0.4741</td>
<td>0.4911</td>
<td>0.4998</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGH-R</td>
<td>0.3974</td>
<td>0.4536</td>
<td>0.4737</td>
<td>0.4874</td>
<td>0.4969</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>0.4806</td>
<td>0.5001</td>
<td>0.5111</td>
<td>0.5253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAH</td>
<td>0.3793</td>
<td>0.4554</td>
<td>0.4871</td>
<td>0.4989</td>
<td>0.5276</td>
<td>0.4121</td>
<td>0.4776</td>
<td>0.5054</td>
<td>0.5196</td>
<td>0.5428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSH</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>0.2203</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>0.1836</td>
<td>0.1421</td>
<td>0.2720</td>
<td>0.2384</td>
<td>0.2141</td>
<td>0.1950</td>
<td>0.1508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Performance of Top-K precision on TINY-1M and MIRFLICKR-1M

3.3 Complexity Analysis
The computation cost can be divided in two parts: initialization and the main procedure. Initialization of $P(X)$ and $Q(X)$, kernel initialization, and initialization of $A_0$ and $Z$ will cost $O((dn + dmn + mn + m^2 + mn)(d + 2 + m^2))$. The main procedure will cost $O(c(mn + m^2 + m^3))$. Typically, $m, d, c$ will be much less than $n$. Hence, the time complexity of SGH is $O(n)$ although all the $n^2$ similarities have been used. Furthermore, the memory cost is also $O(n)$ since the similarity matrix $S$ is not explicitly computed. Therefore, it is expected that SGH is not only accurate but also scalable.

4 Experiment
We use two datasets with one million data points for evaluation. All the experiments are conducted on a workstation with Intel (R) CPU E5-2620V2@2.1G 12 cores and 64G RAM.

4.1 Datasets
We evaluate our method on two widely used large-scale benchmark datasets: TINY-1M [Liu et al., 2014] and MIRFLICKR-1M [Huiskes et al., 2010].

The first dataset is TINY-1M which contains one million images from the 80M tiny images. Each tiny image is represented by a 384-dim GIST descriptors extracted from the original image of size $32 \times 32$.

The second dataset is MIRFLICKR-1M from LIACS Medialab at Leiden University. This dataset has one million Flickr images which are downloaded from Flickr. We extract 512 features from each image.

4.2 Evaluation Protocols and Baselines
For each dataset, we randomly select 5000 data points to construct the test (query) set and the remaining points will be used for training. The groundtruth neighbors of each query are defined as the top 2% nearest neighbors in the training set in terms of the Euclidean distance. So each query has 19900 ground truth neighbors for both datasets.

The baselines for comparison contain one data-independent method LSH [Datar et al., 2004] and some representative unsupervised hashing methods, including two graph-based hashing methods AGH [Liu et al., 2011] and DGH [Liu et al., 2014], two linear projection based methods PCAH [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011] and ITQ [Gong and Lazebnik, 2011]. By using different initialization strategies, DGH has two variants [Liu et al., 2014], DGH-I and DGH-R, both of which are used for comparison. Please note that two other graph hashing methods SH and BRE are not adopted for comparison because existing works have shown that AGH and DGH can outperform them [Liu et al., 2014]. For kernel feature construction, we use Gaussian kernel and take 300 randomly sampled points as kernel bases for our method. We set the parameter $\rho = 2$ in $P(X)$ and $Q(X)$. For all the other baselines, we set the parameters by following the suggestions of the corresponding authors.

The Top-K precision [Liu et al., 2014] is adopted as a metric to evaluate our method and baselines. In real applications such as search engines, the users may only be interested in the top returned results given a query. Hence, the Top-K precision is a good metric for evaluation.

4.3 Accuracy
The Top-1000 precision based on the Hamming ranking results is shown in Table 1. We can see that SGH achieves the best accuracy in all the cases except on MIRFLICKR-1M with 32 bits. In particular, SGH can outperform all the other graph hashing methods in all cases. This shows that SGH is effective to capture the similarity information in the data.

We also report the Top-K precision with other numbers of K (returned samples) in Figure 2 on two datasets with 64 bits
Table 2: Training time on TINY-1M (in second).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>32 bits</th>
<th>64 bits</th>
<th>96 bits</th>
<th>128 bits</th>
<th>256 bits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGH</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td>164.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITQ</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>60.62</td>
<td>89.04</td>
<td>149.18</td>
<td>322.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGH</td>
<td>18.40 + 1438.60</td>
<td>19.40 + 1438.60</td>
<td>20.08 + 1438.60</td>
<td>22.48 + 1438.60</td>
<td>25.09 + 1438.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGH-I</td>
<td>187.57 + 1438.60</td>
<td>296.99 + 1438.60</td>
<td>518.57 + 1438.60</td>
<td>924.08 + 1438.60</td>
<td>1838.30 + 1438.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGH-R</td>
<td>217.06 + 1438.60</td>
<td>360.18 + 1438.60</td>
<td>615.74 + 1438.60</td>
<td>1089.10 + 1438.60</td>
<td>2300.10 + 1438.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAH</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSH</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Training time on MIRFLICKR-1M (in second).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>32 bits</th>
<th>64 bits</th>
<th>96 bits</th>
<th>128 bits</th>
<th>256 bits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGH</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>168.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITQ</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>89.50</td>
<td>132.71</td>
<td>285.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGH</td>
<td>17.99 + 1564.86</td>
<td>18.80 + 1564.86</td>
<td>20.30 + 1564.86</td>
<td>19.87 + 1564.86</td>
<td>21.60 + 1564.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGH-I</td>
<td>85.81 + 1564.86</td>
<td>143.68 + 1564.86</td>
<td>215.41 + 1564.86</td>
<td>352.73 + 1564.86</td>
<td>739.56 + 1564.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGH-R</td>
<td>116.25 + 1564.86</td>
<td>206.24 + 1564.86</td>
<td>308.32 + 1564.86</td>
<td>517.97 + 1564.86</td>
<td>1199.44 + 1564.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAH</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSH</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Speed

We report the time consumption on two datasets in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively. Please note the “+1438.60” and “+1564.86” in the two tables denote the anchor graph constructing time in AGH and DGH. It is fair to include this anchor graph constructing time for comparison because the time of our SGH also includes all the training time. We can find that our SGH is much faster than AGH and DGH in all cases, and is faster than ITQ in most cases. LSH and PCAH are faster than SGH, but their accuracy is not satisfactory.

4.5 Sensitivity to Parameters

Figure 3 shows the Top-1000 precision on TINY-1M and MIRFLICKR-1M for different numbers of kernel bases ($m$). We can find that better accuracy can be achieved with larger $m$, which is consistent with our intuition. However, larger $m$ will result in higher computation cost. Hence, in real applications, we need to choose a suitable $m$ for tradeoff between accuracy and cost.

Figure 4 shows the Top-1000 precision on TINY-1M and MIRFLICKR-1M for different values of $\rho$. We can find that the accuracy is not sensitive to $\rho$ when $1 \leq \rho \leq 5$. One nice phenomenon is that our method achieves the best accuracy when $\rho = 2$ on both datasets.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a novel method, called SGH, for large-scale graph hashing. SGH is scalable by avoiding explicitly computing the similarity matrix, and simultaneously SGH can preserve the entire similarity information in the dataset. Experiments show that SGH can outperform the state-of-the-art methods in terms of both accuracy and scalability.
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