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Abstract

Recently, Transformer-based methods, which predict polygon points or Bezier curve control points to localize texts, are quite popular in scene text detection. However, the used point label form implies the reading order of humans, which affects the robustness of Transformer model. As for the model architecture, the formulation of queries used in decoder has not been fully explored by previous methods. In this paper, we propose a concise dynamic point scene text detection Transformer network termed DPText-DETR, which directly uses point coordinates as queries and dynamically updates them between decoder layers. We point out a simple yet effective positional point label form to tackle the side effect of the original one. Moreover, an Enhanced Factored Self-Attention module is designed to explicitly model the circular shape of polygon point sequences beyond non-local attention. Extensive experiments prove the training efficiency, robustness, and state-of-the-art performance on various arbitrary shape scene text benchmarks. Beyond detector, we observe that existing end-to-end spotters struggle to recognize inverse-like texts. To evaluate their performance objectively and facilitate future research, we propose an Inverse-Text test set containing 500 manually labeled images. The code and Inverse-Text test set will be available at https://github.com/ymy-k/DPText-DETR.

1. Introduction

Recently, text reading and understanding have aroused increasing research interest in computer vision [9,11,13,14,18,20,22,29,39], due to the wide range of practical applications, such as scene understanding and autonomous driving [38]. Scene text detection usually serves as a prerequisite. However, scene text detection remains challenging due to the distinction of scene text, e.g., complex styles and arbitrary orientations.


In the field of scene text detection, recent related methods [31, 44] based on DETR framework achieve remarkable results. To fit the arbitrary shape of scene texts, these methods predict polygon control points sequence on text contour or bezier-curve control points sequence following ABCNet [20]. We have an observation that human-beings
tend to recognize the concrete content of scene texts even if they are in the inverse order, resulting in the corresponding order of polygon annotations, as shown in Figure 1(a). However, the influence of this form of annotations on detection transformer models as well as whether detector can learn this order like a human are not well explored. Interestingly, we find this form of annotations does harm to the detector robustness even the ratio of inverse order instances is quite low in existing benchmark training sets, e.g., about 2.8% in Total-Text [4], 5.2% in CTW1500 [21], and 5.3% in ICDAR2019 ArT [3]. Some flaws are shown in Figure 1(b). Furthermore, the detector fully trained by using rotation augmentation still cannot learn the order of polygon points well, as shown in Figure 1(c).

Back to the scene text detection transformer framework which predicts points. It is useful to provide a position prior for each text instance, e.g., the box-to-polygon mechanism proposed in TESTR [44]. However, box position priors mismatch the target of predicting points for the detector part to some extent, resulting in relatively slow training convergence.

In this paper, we propose a novel Dynamic Point Text Detection Transformer network based on Deformable DETR, namely DPText-DETR, to address the aforementioned issues. First, we point out a useful positional label form for points. It can significantly improve the robustness of the detector with a simple yet effective operation, which makes the start point independent of the semantic content of each text. Second, we directly use point coordinates as position queries in Transformer decoders. With this formulation of point queries, we are able to dynamically update them in decoder layers and achieve faster convergence. Moreover, in order to explicitly model the circular form of polygon points and further boost the convergence, we propose an Enhanced Factorized Self-Attention (EFSA) module inspired by [7], combining non-local self-attention among points with local circular convolution [28].

Beyond scene text detectors, we observe that some existing end-to-end spotters [12, 14, 20, 22, 44] struggle with inverse-like texts. Inverse texts might not appear as often as normal texts, but they also contain crucial information to correctly understand the scene. As illustrated in Figure 1(d), the spotter cannot recognize “EIFFEL” which is the most important clue for the question. This kind of mistake can lead to loss of important information and radically wrong answers predicted by the down-stream scene understanding model, such as a Text-VQA model [29]. However, previous methods didn’t pay much attention to this issue. A direct reason is that there are only a few inverse texts in existing arbitrary shape scene text benchmarks. In order to further promote the recognition ability and robustness of spotter models, we collect a test set containing 500 scene text images with about 40% inverse-like text instances, namely Inverse-Text. Some of them are even mirrored due to photographing, which is more challenging. The training set can be easily obtained by rotating images in existing datasets.

Overall, the main contributions of our work are summarized as follows.

- We propose DPText-DETR scene text detector, which directly uses point position query formulation. In this concise and generic framework, positional point label form significantly improves model robustness and better synergizes with rotation augmentation to further boost model performance. EFSA module provides point features with explicit circular shape guidance and further speeds up the training convergence.

- DPText-DETR sets new state-of-the-art on various benchmarks. Meanwhile, It is up to six times that DPText-DETR converges faster than baseline when training from scratch. DPText-DETR also shows promising few-shot learning ability.

- We establish a novel Inverse-Text test set to fill the gap of lack of inverse-like texts in existing datasets, which could facilitate future research on more advanced and robust end-to-end spotting models.

2. Related Work

2.1. End-to-end Scene Text Detection and Spotting

**Regression-based methods** mainly follow the generic object detection and localize texts using axis-aligned or modified quadrilateral boxes. TextBoxes [16] and TextBoxes++ [15] detect texts by using different anchors with well-designed aspect ratios. EAST [45] directly regresses bounding boxes for scene texts in a anchor-free manner. Although these methods have achieved promising performance on straight text detection, they cannot handle arbitrarily-shaped texts well due to the lack of geometric representation ability.

**Contour-based methods** resort to modeling the text boundary for better representation of arbitrarily-shaped texts. ABCNet [20] and ABCNet-v2 [22] model text instance contour with Bezier curve, while FCENet [47] uses Fourier curve to improve the performance on highly-curved texts. PCR [5] progressively regresses the offsets of polygon points on boundary to get final tight bounding polygons in the top-down manner. TextBPN [42] and TextBPN++ [43] segment various probability maps and use them as priors to generate coarse boundary proposals, then iteratively refine boundary points with the assistance of graph convolution or Transformer encoder. More recently, [31] samples a few representative features to perform scene text detection and predicts Bezier curves to localize texts. TESTR [44] adopts box-to-polygon scheme to guide the prediction
of boundary points or control points of Beizer curve with box position priors. And in TESTR, dual Transformer decoder architecture is used to perform spotting simultaneously, where detection and recognition decoder share the same reference point from anchor for each sub-query.

2.2. Detection Transformers

Transformer originates from [32] for machine translation and soon becomes popular in computer vision [8, 23, 36, 40, 41]. In recent years, frameworks based on Transformer prevail in object detection. DETR [2] treats object detection as a set prediction problem and proposes a concise framework without complex handcrafted anchor generation and post-processing. Following DETR, Deformable DETR [46] significantly improves the slow convergence of DETR by attending to sparse features. DE-DETR [35] identifies the key factor that affects data efficiency is sparse feature sampling through a step-by-step transition from a data-efficient RCNN variant to the representative DETR. DAB-DETR [19] offers a deeper understanding of the role of queries in DETR and directly uses box coordinates as queries in Transformer decoder to facilitate the training convergence and boost performance.

3. Method

Following Deformable DETR, DPTText-DETR consists of similar components. We investigate the influence of control point labels on the robustness of model and mainly improve the decoder part. We propose an Explicit Point Query Modeling (i.e., EPQM, including Prior Points Sampling and Point Update) method and an Enhanced Factorized Self-Attention (EFSA) module in our scene text detector. In this section, we first briefly describe the overall pipeline and then detail the motivation and implementation.

3.1. Overview

The overall model architecture is illustrated in Figure 2. In general, given a scene text image, we use a CNN backbone followed by a transformer encoder to extract enhanced features. After the final encoder layer, multiple axis-aligned boxes are generated according to the two-stage scheme described in [46]. With the center point coordinate, width and height information of each anchor box, we can directly calculate a certain number of initial control point coordinates uniformly on the top and bottom sides. In this way, these initial control point coordinates can be used as suitable reference points for the deformable cross-attention module in decoder layers. In the decoder, control point coordinates are embedded and added to corresponding control point content queries. The composite queries are firstly sent to the EFSA module to further mine their relative relationships and then fed into the deformable cross-attention module. Then control point coordinate prediction heads are adopted to dynamically update the reference points layer-by-layer to better fit arbitrary shape scene texts. Finally, prediction heads are used to generate class prediction confidence scores and control point coordinates for each composite query Q. During training, we follow [44] to calculate losses for classification and control points.

3.2. Positional Label Form

The original label form shown in Figure 1(a) is in line with human reading order. However, this form induces detector to implicitly learn the reading order of texts, resulting in the flaws shown in Figure 1(b). It is difficult for the detector to learn the reading order correctly with vision features
even after sufficient rotation training adaptation.

Hence, as illustrated in Figure 3, we propose the positional label form to guide detector to learn the top and bottom side of scene texts in a pure spatial sense without considering the concrete content meaning of text instances. The positional label form mainly follows two simple rules: clockwise and pure positional. In particular, firstly, we double-check all the original point labels that are in a clockwise order. Secondly, if the original top side of a text instance lies in the bottom position, the starting point will be adjusted to the other side. When two sides are arranged left and right, if there is one side with a smaller minimum \( y \) value (origin in left-top), the starting point will be adjusted to this side, otherwise, it will be on the fixed default side.

### 3.3. Explicit Point Query Modeling

**Prior Points Sampling.** It is remarkable to transform axis-aligned boxes into polygons that fit scene texts with a concise yet effective operation, i.e., the box-to-polygon scheme proposed by [44]. In this section, we firstly review this scheme. After the final encoder layer, each anchor box information provided by a top-\( K \) proposal generator is encoded then shared by control point content queries. In this way, the initial control point composite queries \( Q^{(i)}(i = 1, \ldots, K) \) can be formulated as following:

\[
Q^{(i)} = D^{(i)} + C = \varphi(box^{(i)}) + (p_1, \ldots, p_N),
\]

where \( P \) and \( C \) represent the positional and the content part of each composite query, respectively. \( \varphi \) is the sine positional encoding function followed with a linear and normalization layer. \( box \) represents the center coordinate and scale information \( (x, y, w, h) \) of each anchor box. \( N \) is the default number of control points and \( (p_1, \ldots, p_N) \) is the control point content query embedding shared across \( K \) queries. Note that we set the detector with the composite query formulation in equation 1 as our baseline. From equation 1, we could find that different control point content queries share the same anchor box prior information in each composite query. Though the box position prior facilitates model training, it mismatches the point target to some extent. Content queries lack respective explicit position priors to exploit in the box sub-region. Inspired by the positional label form mentioned in Sec. 3.2 and the shape prior that

the top and bottom edge of a scene text are usually close to corresponding sides of its bounding box, we calculate \( N/2 \) point coordinates \( point_n(n = 1, \ldots, N) \) uniformly on the top and bottom side of each anchor box, respectively:

\[
point_n = \begin{cases} 
(x - \frac{w}{2} + \frac{(n-1)\times w}{N/2-I}, y - \frac{h}{2}), & n \leq N/2 \\
(x - \frac{w}{2} + \frac{(N-n)\times w}{N/2-I}, y + \frac{h}{2}), & n> N/2
\end{cases},
\]

(2)

With \( \{point_1, \ldots, point_N\} \) as the individual point position priors, we can generate composite queries in a fully point formulation:

\[
Q^{(i)} = \varphi((point_1, \ldots, point_N) + (p_1, \ldots, p_N)),
\]

(3)

In this way, the control point content queries own their respective explicit position prior.

**Point Update.** With the point coordinate positional query formulation, we can refine control point positions layer-by-layer and use the updated positions as new reference points for deformable cross-attention. In contrast, previous method [44] directly adopts the anchor boxes information to generate positional queries. Therefore, it is hard to perform refinement between decoder layers. Specifically, in our model, we update control points in each decoder layer after getting respective offset \( (\Delta x, \Delta y) \) by a prediction head, as shown in the decoder layer part of Figure 2.

### 3.4. Enhanced Factorized Self-Attention

We follow [7] to exploit Factorized Self-Attention to mine the relationship between \( N \) point sub-queries within each \( Q \) first, termed as intra self-attention, denoted as \( SA_{intra} \). We can get \( F_{intra} = SA_{intra}(Q) \), where keys are the same as \( Q \) while values don’t contain positional information in the intra self-attention. However, the pure non-local attention for sub-queries ignore the indeed circular shape of point sequences. Thus, we further combine the non-local self-attention with local circular convolution. We adopt 4-neighborhood in circular convolution. Local features \( F_{local} = ReLU(BN(CirConv(Q))) \), and fused features \( F = LN(FC(C + LN(F_{intra} + F_{local})) \) are obtained accordingly, where \( C \) represents the content queries used as a shortcut, \( FC \) is a fully connected layer, \( BN \) is BatchNorm, and \( LN \) is LayerNorm. Then, \( F \) is fed into a inter self-attention module \( SA_{inter} \) to mine the relationship between different text instances: \( F_{inter} = SA_{inter}(F) \). Then, \( F_{inter} \) is sent to the deformable cross-attention part.

### 4. Experiments

We conduct experiments on three arbitrarily-shaped scene text benchmarks: Total-Text [4], CTW1500 [21] and ICDAR19 ArT [3]. The ablation studies are conducted on Total-Text to verify the effectiveness of each component of our methods.
Table 1. Scene Text detection results on Total-Text, CTW1500 and ArT. Best results are in bold, while the second ones are underlined. “†” represents the result on ArT is collected from official website [3].

![Figure 4. Qualitative detection results on Total-Text, CTW1500, and ArT from left to right. Zoom in and color for better view.](image)

4.1. Datasets

We briefly introduce the datasets used in this paper. SynthText 150K [20] is a synthesized dataset for arbitrarily-shaped scene text, containing 94,723 images with multi-oriented text and 54,327 images with curved text. TotalText [4] consists of 1,255 training images and 300 testing images. The Word-level polygon are provided as the annotation. Rot.Total-Text is a test set derived from the Total-Text test set. Since the original label form induces model to generate unstable prediction shown in Figure 1(b), we apply large angles of rotation ($-45^\circ$, $-30^\circ$, $-15^\circ$, $15^\circ$, $30^\circ$, $45^\circ$) on images in the Total-Text test set to test the model robustness, resulting in total 1,800 testing images including the original test set. CTW1500 [21] contains 1,000 training images and 500 testing images. It is annotated in text-line level. ICDAR19 ArT [3] is a large arbitrary shape scene text benchmark. It contains 5,603 training images and 4,563 testing images. ICDAR19 LSVT [30] is a large scale real scene Chinese datasets which contains 30,000 training images.

Inverse-Text established in this work, consists of 500 testing images. It is a challenging arbitrarily-shaped scene text test set with about 40% inverse-like scene texts, and some of these texts are even mirrored. Some of these images are picked from existing benchmark test sets, i.e., 121 images from ICDAR19 ArT, 7 images from Total-Text, and 3 images from CTW1500. Word-level polygon annotations are provided. Some images are shown in Figure 6.

4.2. Implementation Details

We adopt ResNet-50 [10] as the backbone. We use 8 heads for multi-head attention and 4 sampling points for deformable attention, with both 6 layers for encoder and decoder. The composite queries number $K$ is 100 and default control points number $N$ is 16. We follow the hyper-parameter setting of loss used in the detection part of [44]. All experiments are performed using NVIDIA A100 (40G) GPUs and the models are tested on 1 GPU.

In ablation studies, we do not pre-train model to intuitively reveal the training convergence. We train on Total-Text for 120k without rotation adaptation and directly test on Rot.Total-Text to verify the robustness. To examine whether the model can learn the text order well, we rotate Total-Text training data ranging from ($-45^\circ$, $-30^\circ$, $-15^\circ$, $15^\circ$, $30^\circ$, $45^\circ$, $90^\circ$) for normal cases, and also rotate all of them for $180^\circ$ for inverse cases. When using rotation data, we train the model for 200k iterations.

The complete training can be divided into pre-training and finetuning stage. We fully pre-train our model for better performance. The batch-size is set to 8 in all experiments. For Total-Text and CTW1500, we pre-train model on a mixture of SynthText 150K, MLT 2017 [27] and Total-Text for...
forms well on straight, vertical, curve, and even dense long texts are displayed in Figure 4. It shows our model performs extremely compact curved texts.

As described in 4.2, pre-training is not used in all experiments of this section. Main ablation results are represented in Table 2. Note that our model without pre-training can achieve competitive performance (86.99% F-measure) compared with previous models with pre-training.

**Positional Label.** As shown in Table 2, when using the positional label (Pos.Label), the F-measure scores on both test sets are improved. For example, comparing line 1 and line 2, the F-measure is improved 0.68% gain in terms of F-measure. And in Table 3, EFSA makes an ideal gain in performance. However, even small angle rotations might turn some texts into inverse-like, hence the positional label can better collaborate with rotation to alleviate this side effect. When using rotation, Pos.Label also contributes to faster convergence as shown in Figure 5(a).

**EPQM.** In Table 2, we investigate the influence of EPQM. EPQM intuitively boosts the performance and makes the major contribution to the convergence as shown in Figure 5(a). Moreover, we find EPQM significantly improves the few-show learning ability as shown in Table 3. When the training iterations and data volume are decreased, huge performance degradation of baseline models turns up, while the models with EPQM are far less affected.

**EFSA.** We further verify the effectiveness of EFSA. Related results are presented in Table 2 and Table 3. In Table 2, for example, comparing line 5 and line 6, EFSA brings 0.89% gain in F-measure. And in Table 3, EFSA makes the model have better learning ability in the case of the fewer samples, such as the extra 11.95% gain in terms of F-measure with 25% training data volume compared with the model only equipped with EPQM. EFSA also further improves the training convergence as shown in Figure 5(a).

In summary, positional label mainly improves the model robustness while EPQM and EFSA promote the overall performance, training convergence, and few-shot learning ability. The model with all components achieves ideal trade-off between performance and inference speed. Positional label and EPQM also work well in the Bezier control points version of our model (See appendix).
Table 3. Fewer iterations and fewer training data test for EPQM and EFSA. “TD-Ratio” represents training data ratio compared with origin training dataset. In the first three rows, models are only trained for 12k iterations from scratch on Total-Text without any rotation augmentation. In the rest parts, we randomly sample training data according to TD-Ratio while keeping the equivalent epochs as used in the first three rows, we train 6k iterations for the middle three rows and 3k for last ones.

Table 4. Analysis on EPQM. The results are test on Total-Text without using positional label.

Table 5. Results of spotters on Total-Text. “None” denotes the end-to-end results without using lexicon.

Table 6. Results on Inverse-Text. “None” has the same meaning in Table 5. None test-time augmentation is used.

Figure 5. Convergence curves on Rot.Total-Text (left) and Total-Text (right). Zoom in for better view.

Figure 6. End-to-end detection results on Inverse-Text.

4.5. What Makes Faster Training Convergence?

We conduct further ablations on EPQM to explore what makes faster convergence. Quantitative results are reported in Table 4, and the convergence curves are plotted in Figure 5(b). The performance does not change much when only Prior Points Sampling is used, but the convergence at the initial training stage is improved, as shown in Figure 5(b). Meanwhile, Point Update makes the major contribution to the performance and further boosts the convergence by a large margin. It indicates that the explicit position modeling for sparse points is the key to faster convergence. The explicit formulation is the prerequisite for dynamically updating points in decoder layers. Then, dynamic updating provides more precise reference points for deformable cross-attention, resulting in better features and better performance. In prior works [19, 35], it is shown that box query formulation and sparse box area features extracted by ROIAlign can benefit the training efficiency of DETR-like models. In our model, the Prior Points Sampling scheme can be regarded as a soft grid-sample operation. It proves that point query formulation, which is more sparse than the box, can still facilitate training.

4.6. Beyond Detector

We further explore the spotter framework with our detector. We conduct experiments based on TESTR [44] with dual decoder, where its detection decoder is replaced by ours. In this way, the queries used in the detection and recognition part are in different formulations. However, it still works well and even performs better. Results are shown in Table 5 and Table 6. Since the pre-trained model on Total-Text offered by the official repository of TESTR is not fully adapted to rotation, we apply rotation augmentation in finetuning. When using our detector, both detection and end-to-end results are improved.

On Inverse-Text, the models trained on Total-Text are adopted to perform direct evaluation, resulting in similar detection performance compared with Table 5, but significantly lower end-to-end results. It indicates the models struggle with the hard cases in Inverse-Text. The above results validate the effectiveness of our detector. Some visual results on Inverse-Text are shown in Figure 6.
5. Conclusion

We present a concise yet effective scene text detection Transformer network, which converts composite queries into fully point formulation. We investigate the effect of control point labels on model robustness and point out a positional label form. Extensive experiments demonstrate the state-of-the-art performance, training efficiency, and robustness of our proposed DPText-DETR. We also establish a challenging Inverse-Text test set to facilitate future research in this area.

Appendix

A. Samples of Inverse-Text

More samples of Inverse-Text are presented in Figure 7.

![Figure 7. More samples of Inverse-Text.](image)

B. Ablations on Circular Convolution

We make ablations on the circular convolution used in the EFSA module. From Table 7, using 1 layer and 4-neighborhood achieves the best trade-off between the performance and inference speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>F-measure</th>
<th>FPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86.17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.39</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.57</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86.14</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Ablations on the circular convolution used in the EFSA module. “Adj.” represents the number of adjacency elements.

B. Ablations on Bezier Version Detector

We further verify the effectiveness of the positional label form and proposed EPQM on the detector which predicts Bezier control points. The positional label form and EPQM can improve the performance, training convergence, and robustness of the Bezier version detector, as shown in Table 8 and Figure 8. However, the Bezier control points of each text instance do not always form in circular shape and sometimes they are far apart. It is not suitable to combine circular convolution with self-attention in this situation. EFSA is more effective when control points on the text boundary are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Pos.Label</th>
<th>EPQM</th>
<th>Rotation</th>
<th>Total-Text</th>
<th>Rot.Total-Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>18.0 71.37 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>18.0 74.11 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.80</td>
<td>17.0 73.82 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>18.0 84.16 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.30</td>
<td>18.0 84.65 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline+</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.64</td>
<td>17.0 85.03 19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Ablations of Bezier version detector on Total-Text and Rot.Total-Text without pre-training. “Pos.Label” represents the positional label form.

![Figure 8. Convergence curves on Rot.Total-Text.](image)
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