

Table 1: Extended “Table 2” in submitted paper. Segmentation results on BSD500 dataset.

Methods	NCut	NCut-DF	DeepNCut	Ours-LR	Ours-HR	Embedding
MAX	0.53	0.56	0.70	0.78	0.80	0.77
AVR	0.44	0.48	0.60	0.68	0.69	0.67

Table 2: Extended “Table 3” in submitted paper. Results for weakly supervised semantic segmentation on VOC2012.

Methods	MIL	Saliency	RegGrow	RandWalk	AISI	Ours	Embedding
Val	42.0	55.7	59.0	59.5	63.6	65.8	54.7
Test	-	56.7	-	-	64.5	66.3	54.9

1 We thank reviewers for their comments, and will carefully revise paper considering these comments.

2 *Q1 (R1): References and comparison with a baseline that learns embeddings only through a standard convnet.*

3 Thanks for recommending these papers on learning embeddings for pairwise distance computation and we will include
 4 them in our paper. Different from directly computing pairwise distance of pixels, our diffusion distance measures
 5 pixel distance by diffusion on graph in a concept of random walks, and distances are computed in the eigen-space of
 6 transition matrix (i.e., diffusion maps). Figure 1 in this rebuttal compares examples of learned similarity by siamese
 7 network using Resnet-101 backbone same as ours (denoted as “Embedding” in the following), and it can be seen that
 8 our neural diffusion distance is smooth and continuous. In Tab.1 and Tab. 2 in this rebuttal (i.e., the extensions of Tab. 2
 9 and Tab. 3 in submitted paper), we added a column in each table showing results with the “Embedding” substituting our
 10 neural diffusion distance, it is shown that our neural diffusion distance produced better performance for hierarchical
 11 segmentation (Tab. 1) and weakly supervised segmentation (Tab. 2).



Figure 1: Visual comparison of similarity maps between embedding method and our neural diffusion distance. Each map shows the similarities w.r.t. the central pixel in the image.

12 *Q2 (R2): Unfairness in comparison.* In Tab.2 of this rebuttal, the state-of-the-art method of AISI [7] also depends on
 13 external MS-COCO segmentation labels in their approach. RandWalk [29] uses human-labeled scribbles when training
 14 segmentation network. Saliency [22] method depends on saliency model trained with bounding box annotations of
 15 MSRA dataset. We will give more details of these compared methods in paper for clarity.

16 *Q3 (R2): Implementation/training details.*

17 In all the training tasks in the paper, we use Adam optimization algorithm. The learning rates are set to 1e-6 for
 18 training spec-diff-net, 3e-7 for weakly supervised network in Fig. 4, and 1e-6 for image segmentation network. It takes
 19 160000, 20000, 20000 network updating steps for training the above three cases respectively. We will include more
 20 implementation details in the paper.

21 *Q4 (R3): Originality / novelty.* Diffusion distance is a mathematically sound distance on graph as defined in sect. 3.
 22 This paper is an novel try to take advantage of deep network to learn diffusion distance for segmentation by extending it
 23 to “neural diffusion distance” using end-to-end training. Several technical novelties have been proposed to achieve
 24 that goal, including the proposed spec-diff-net, approximate eigen-decomposition with its convergence analysis, two
 25 training losses, attention-based upsampling. Moreover, we apply it to two segmentation tasks with novel designs of
 26 corresponding kernel k-means based hierarchical segmentation algorithm and attention-based semantic segmentation
 27 network. These novel techniques enable promising results for image hierarchical clustering and weakly supervised
 28 semantic segmentation.

29 *Q5 (R3): Results on segmentation benchmark, compare with one baseline on weakly supervised segmentation.*

30 We respectfully disagree because we evaluate neural diffusion distance for hierarchical image segmentation on bench-
 31 mark BSD500 dataset, and weakly supervised semantic segmentation on benchmark VOC2012 dataset. These two
 32 datasets are popular for image segmentation. We extensively compared with different methods as shown in Tables 2, 3,
 33 and different baselines by ablation study in Tables 1, 4 of the submitted paper.