CS4442/9542b Artificial Intelligence II prof. Olga Veksler

Lecture 10 Computer Vision Grouping and Segmentation

Some slides are from S. Seitz, D. Jacobs, O. Camps, A. Torralba

Outline

- Grouping problems in vision
 - Image segmentation: grouping of pixels
- Grouping cues in Human Visual System
 - Gestalt perceptual grouping laws
- Image Segmentation
 - 2-region (binary)
 - thresholding
 - graph cuts
 - used in MS office 2010 for background removal
 - based on the work of our faculty Yuri Boykov
- General Grouping (or unsupervised learning)
 - K-means clustering

Examples of Grouping in Vision

- Group pixels into regions
 - image segmentation

•

Group video frames into shots





• Group image regions into objects



Image Segmentation



- For many applications, useful to segment image pixels into blobs that (hopefully) belong to the same object or surface
- How to do this without (necessarily) object recognition?
 - a bit subjective, but well-studied
- Inspiration from Gestalt psychology
 - humans perceive the world as a collection of objects with relationships between them, not as a set of pixels

Gestalt Psychology

- Whole is greater than the sum of its parts
 - eye sees an object in its entirety before perceiving its individual parts
- Identified factors that predispose a set of elements to be grouped by human visual system
 - perceptual grouping



Grouping

Most human observers report no particular grouping

• Common form, includes:



• Proximity



• Good continuation



- Connectivity
 - stronger than color



• Symmetry



• Familiarity



• Closure





• Closure

• Common fate





• Higher level knowledge?



- Many other Gestalt grouping principles
 - parallelism, convexity, colinearity, common depth, etc.
- Gestalt principles are an inspiration to computer vision
 - they seem to rely on nature of objects in the world, most do not involve higher level knowledge (object recognition)
 - should help to segment objects without necessarily performing object recognition
- But most are difficult to implement in algorithms
 - used often
 - color, proximity
 - we will use these as well
 - used sometimes
 - convexity, good continuation, common motion, colinearity

Image Segmentation

Many types of image segmentation



- We will focus on figure-ground (FG)
 - also called object/background segmentation

FG Segmentation: Thresholding

• Suppose the object is brighter than the background



Threshold gray scale image f:
if f(x,y) < T then pixel (x,y) is background
if f(x,y) ≥ T then pixel (x,y) is foreground

T



= 120	<i>T</i> = 180	<i>T</i> = 220

FG Segmentation: Thresholding

- Tiny isolated foreground regions, isolated background regions
- Result looks wrong even if you did not know object is a swan



• Can we clean this result up?

FG Segmentation: Motivation

- Know object is light, background is dark
- Do not know object shape
 - show background with red, foreground with blue



input image



bad result: crazy object shape



bad result: object is dark, background light



good result: light object of good shape, dark background

FG Segmentation: Energy Function

- Formulate an **objective** or **energy** function *E* to measure how good segmentation is
 - low value means good segmentation
- After energy function is designed, search over all possible segmentations for the best one
 - one with lowest energy



FG Segmentation: Energy Function

- Energy has two terms
 - data term:
 - makes it cheap to assign light pixels to foreground, expensive to the background
 - makes it cheap to assign dark pixels to the background, and expensive to the foreground
 - smoothness term: ensures nice object shape
 - both terms are needed for a good energy function



input image f

FG Segmentation: Data Term

- Should be cheap to assign light pixels to foreground, expensive to the background
- For each pixel (x,y), we will pay D (x,y) (background) to assign it to background and D (x,y) (foreground) to assign it to the foreground
- Let the smallest image intensity be 5, and largest 20

 $D_{(x,y)}(background) = f(x,y) - 5$

 $D_{(x,y)}$ (foreground) = 20 - f(x,y)





background data term D



foreground data term D

• Brown pixel prefers foreground, green prefers background

FG Segmentation: Data Term

- *E*_{data} sums data *D*_(x,y) term over all pixels (*x*,*y*)
- Foreground blue, background red



background D



foreground D





 $\mathbf{E}_{data} = 6+3+1+6+1+ \\
3+1+1+7+7+ \\
1+1+0+5+2+ \\
7+6+7+0+0+ \\
6+1+2+0+0 \\
= 64$

FG Segmentation: Smoothness Term

- Smoothness term: ensures nice object shape
- Consider segmentations below



- discontinuity: when two nearby pixels are in different segments
- smoothness term is the number of discontinuities

FG Segmentation: Total Energy

• Now combine both data and smoothness energy terms



- What went wrong ?
- Smoothness term weighs very little relative to the data term
 - it basically gets ignored in the combined energy
- Solution: increase the weight of the smoothness term

FG Segmentation: Total Energy

• Solution: increase the weight of the smoothness term

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{data} + \lambda \mathbf{E}_{smooth}$

• Take, for example, $\lambda = 10$



FG Segmentation: Energy Formula

- Now we need to put everything into formulas
- *s*(*x*,*y*) is the segmentation **label**

s(x,y) = 1 means (x,y) is foreground pixel s(x,y) = 0 means (x,y) is background pixel

- Convenient to write pixel (x,y) as p (or q, r,...)
- Denote all pairs of nearby pixels: N

p	q	r	
V	u	W	
у	h	Ζ	

 $N = \{ (p,q), (q,r), (v,u), (u,w), (y,h), (h,z), (p,v), (v,y), (q,u), (u,h), (r,w), (w,z) \}$



input image **f**

0	1	1	0	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	0	0
1	0	1	0	0
0	1	0	0	0

segmentation s

$$E(s) = E_{data}(s) + \lambda \cdot E_{smooth}(s) = \sum_{p} D_{p}(s_{p}) + \lambda \sum_{(p,q) \in N} [s_{p} \neq s_{q}]$$

• where [true] = 1, [false] = 0

FG Segmentation: Formula Practice with $\lambda = 1$

$$E(s) = \sum_{p} D_{p}(s_{p}) + \lambda \sum_{(p,q) \in N} [s_{p} \neq s_{q}]$$



pixel names background D

foreground D

$$E\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = D_{v}(0) + D_{q}(1) + D_{r}(0) D_{v}(0) + D_{u}(0) + D_{w}(0) + \begin{bmatrix} s_{p} \neq s_{q} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_{q} \neq s_{r} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_{v} \neq s_{u} \end{bmatrix} D_{v}(0) + D_{u}(0) + D_{w}(0) + \begin{bmatrix} s_{u} \neq s_{w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_{v} \neq s_{u} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_{h} \neq s_{z} \end{bmatrix} D_{v}(0) + D_{h}(1) + D_{z}(1) segmentation s$$

$$= \begin{array}{c} 9+12+1 \\ 3+1+1 \\ 1+14+15 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1+1+0 \\ 0+1+0 \\ 0+1+0 \\ 0+1+1 \end{array} = 57+6=63$$

FG Segmentation: Contrast Sensitive Discontinuity

• Where is object boundary more likely?



- Make discontinuity cost depend on image contrast
 - helps align object boundary with image edges



- Replace $[\mathbf{s}_p \neq \mathbf{s}_q]$ with $\mathbf{w}_{pq} \cdot [\mathbf{s}_p \neq \mathbf{s}_q]$ where \mathbf{w}_{pq} is
 - large if intensities of pixels *p*,*q* are similar
 - small if intensities of pixels *p*,*q* are not similar

FG Segmentation: Contrast Sensitive Discontinuity

$$\frac{(f(p)-f(q))^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

- Good choice $w_{pq} = \lambda \cdot e^{2\sigma}$
- Where *f*(*p*) is intensity of pixel *p*, *f*(*q*) intensity of pixel *q*
 - for color image average over R, G, B channels to get f(p)



- Parameter σ² is either set by hand (trail and error)
- or computed as average of $(f(p) f(q))^2$ over all neighbors in **N**

$$\sigma^{2} = \frac{(5-4)^{2} + (4-7)^{2} + (5-6)^{2} + (6-4)^{2} + (6-5)^{2} + (5-3)^{2} + (5-5)^{2} + (4-6)^{2} + (7-4)^{2} + (5-6)^{2} + (6-5)^{2} + (4-3)^{2}}{12}$$

FG Segmentation: Contrast Sensitive Discontinuity

$$\frac{(f(p)-f(q))^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

- Good choice $w_{pq} = \lambda \cdot e$
- Parameter σ² estimates a "typical" (average) intensity difference between pixels
- Smaller weight edges between pixels with less than typical intensity difference
- Larger edge weights between pixels with typical intensity difference
- Complete energy
 - note that is now folded into *w*_{pq}

$$E(s) = \sum_{p} D_{p}(s_{p}) + \sum_{(p,q) \in N} W_{pq}[s_{p} \neq s_{q}]$$

FG Segmentation: Example

$$E(s) = \sum_{p} D_{p}(s_{p}) + \sum_{(p,q) \in N} W_{pq}[s_{p} \neq s_{q}]$$





contrast sensitive weights

$$E\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \text{data term as before} + \begin{array}{l} 3 \cdot [s_p \neq s_q] + 2 \cdot [s_q \neq s_r] + 6 \cdot [s_v \neq s_u] \\ 2 \cdot [s_u \neq s_w] + 7 \cdot [s_v \neq s_h] + 1 \cdot [s_h \neq s_z] \\ 3 \cdot [s_p \neq s_v] + 2 \cdot [s_q \neq s_u] + 6 \cdot [s_r \neq s_w] \\ 4 \cdot [s_v \neq s_v] + 2 \cdot [s_u \neq s_h] + 1 \cdot [s_w \neq s_z] \end{array}$$

$$= 57 + \frac{0+7+0}{0+2+0} = 57+15=72$$

0+2+1

FG Segmentation: Optimization

• We are all set to find the best segmentation **s***

s*=arg min E(s)

- How to do this efficiently?
- Even for a 9 pixel image, there are 2⁹ possible segmentations!



• O(2ⁿ) for an *n* pixel image
FG Segmentation: Optimization Graph

- Build weighted graph
 - one node per pixel
 - connect to neighbor pixel nodes with weight \boldsymbol{w}_{pq}
 - two special nodes (terminals) source s, sink t
 - **s** connects to each pixel node **p** with weight $D_{p}(0)$
 - **t** connects to each pixel node **p** with weight $D_p(1)$
 - graph below omits most of these edges for clarity



foreground D background D









FG Segmentation: Optimization with Graph Cut



- Cut is subset of edges C s.t. removing C
 from graph makes s and t disconnected
 - cost of cut **C** is sum of its edge weights
- Minimum Graph Cut Problem
 - find a cut *C* of minimum cost
- Minimum cut *C* gives the smallest cost segmentation [Boykov&Veksler, 1998]
 - nodes that stay connected to source in the `cut' graph become foreground
 - nodes that stay connected to sink in the `cut' graph become background
 - In the example, *p* gets background label,
 v and *y* get foreground label
- Efficient algorithms for min-cut/max-flow



FG Segmentation: Segmentation Result



input



- Data terms
 - blue means low weight, red high weight



foreground



background

- Contrast sensitive edge weights
 - dark means low weight, bright high weight



horizontal



vertical

FG Segmentation: Interactive

- What if we do not know object/background color?
- Can ask user for help
- Interactive Segmentation [Boykov&Jolly, 2001]





- User scribbles foreground and background seeds
 - these are hard constrained to be foreground and background, respectively
 - for any pixel **p** that user marks as a foreground, set $D_p(1) = 0$, $D_p(0) = \infty$
 - for any pixel **p** that user marks as a background, set $D_p(1) = \infty$, $D_p(0) = 0$
 - for unmarked pixels, set $D_p(1) = D_p(0) = 0$
- Smoothness term is as before
 - Contrast sensitive works best for interactive segmentation

FG Segmentation: Interactive Results

• Initial seeds:



• Add more seeds for correction:





FG Segmentation: More Interactive Results





General Grouping or Clustering

- General Clustering (Grouping)
- Have samples (also called feature vectors, examples, etc.) x₁,...,x_n
- Cluster similar samples into groups
- This is also called unsupervised learning
 - samples have no labels
 - think of clusters as 'discovering' labels





How does this Relate to Image Segmentation?

- Represent image pixels as feature vectors **x**₁,...,**x**_n
 - For example, each pixel can be represented as
 - intensity, gives one dimensional feature vectors
 - color, gives three-dimensional feature vectors
 - color + coordinates, gives five-dimensional feature vectors
- Cluster them into *k* clusters, i.e. *k* segments





- **[9 4 2] [7 3 1] [8 6 8]**
- **[8 2 4] [5 8 5] [3 7 2]**
- **[9 4 5] [2 9 3] [1 4 4]**

How does this Relate to Image Segmentation?

input image



 feature vectors for color and image coordinates

 [9] 4
 2
 0
 0]
 [7] 3
 1
 0
 1]
 [8] 6
 8
 0
 2]

 [8] 2
 4
 1
 0]
 [5] 8
 5
 1
 1]
 [3] 7
 2
 1
 2]

 [9] 4
 5
 2
 0]
 [2] 9
 3
 2
 1]
 [1] 4
 4
 2
 2]

K-means Clustering: Objective Function

- Probably the most popular clustering algorithm
 - assumes know the number of clusters should be *k*
- Optimizes (approximately) the following objective function

$$J_{SSE} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{x \in D_i} \left\| x - \mu_i \right\|^2$$



K-means Clustering: Objective Function



Good (tight) clustering smaller value of J_{SSE}



Bad (loose) clustering larger value of J_{SSE}

- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly
 - 2. assign each sample to closest center



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly
 - 2. assign each sample to closest center
- Iteration step
 - 1. compute means in each cluster



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly
 - 2. assign each sample to closest center
- Iteration step
 - 1. compute means in each cluster
 - 2. re-assign each sample to the closest mean



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly
 - 2. assign each sample to closest center
- Iteration step
 - 1. compute means in each cluster
 - 2. re-assign each sample to the closest mean
- Iterate until clusters stop changing



- Initialization step
 - 1. pick *k* cluster centers randomly
 - 2. assign each sample to closest center
- Iteration step
 - 1. compute means in each cluster
 - 2. re-assign each sample to the closest mean
- Iterate until clusters stop changing
- Can prove that this procedure decreases the value of the objective function **J**_{SEE}



K-means: Approximate Optimization

- K-means is fast and works quite well in practice
- But can get stuck in a local minimum of objective J_{SEE}
 - not surprising, since the problem is NP-hard









• with *k* = 2



feature vectors [9 4 2] [7 3 1] [8 6 8] [8 2 4] [5 8 5] [3 7 2] [9 4 5] [2 9 3] [1 4 4]

- with *k* = 2
- Initialize
 - pick [9 4 2] [5 8 5] as cluster centers



featu	are vectors	
[<mark>9 4 2</mark>]	[<mark>7 3 1</mark>]	[<mark>8 6 8</mark>]
[<mark>8 2 4</mark>]	[<mark>5 8 5</mark>]	[3 7 2]
[<mark>9 4 5</mark>]	[<mark>2 9 3</mark>]	[1 4 4]

- with *k* = 2
- Initialize
 - pick [9 4 2] [5 8 5] as cluster centers
 - assign each feature vector to closest center



dist($[9 \ 4 \ 2] - [9 \ 4 \ 2]) = 0 \implies [9 \ 4 \ 2]$ goes to pink cluster

- with *k* = 2
- Initialize
 - pick [9 4 2] [5 8 5] as cluster centers
 - assign each feature vector to closest center



dist($[9 \ 4 \ 2] - [9 \ 4 \ 2]) = 0 \implies [9 \ 4 \ 2]$ goes to pink cluster

dist($[7 \ 3 \ 1] - [9 \ 4 \ 2]$) = $(7-9)^2 + (3-4)^2 + (1-2)^2 = 6$ [7 3 1] goes dist($[7 \ 3 \ 1] - [5 \ 8 \ 5]$) = $(7-5)^2 + (3-8)^2 + (1-5)^2 = 45$ to pink cluster

- with *k* = 2
- Initialize
 - pick [9 4 2] [5 8 5] as cluster centers
 - assign each feature vector to closest center



dist([9 4 2] - [9 4 2]) = 0 \Rightarrow [9 4 2] goes to pink cluster

dist($[7 \ 3 \ 1] - [9 \ 4 \ 2]$) = $(7-9)^2 + (3-4)^2 + (1-2)^2 = 6$ dist($[7 \ 3 \ 1] - [5 \ 8 \ 5]$) = $(7-5)^2 + (3-8)^2 + (1-5)^2 = 45$ [7 \ 3 \ 1] goes to pink cluster dist($[8 \ 6 \ 8] - [9 \ 4 \ 2]$) = $(8-9)^2 + (6-4)^2 + (8-2)^2 = 41$ dist($[8 \ 6 \ 8] - [5 \ 8 \ 5]$) = $(8-5)^2 + (6-8)^2 + (8-5)^2 = 22$ [8 \ 6 \ 8] goes to blue cluster

- with *k* = 2
- Initialize
 - pick [9 4 2] [5 8 5] as cluster centers
 - assign each feature vector to closest center
 - repeat for the rest of feature vectors

[8 2 4] [5 8 5] [3 7 2]

[9 4 5] [2 9 3] [1 4 4]



initial clustering

- Iterate
 - compute cluster means



$$\mu_{1} = \frac{[9 \ 4 \ 2] + [7 \ 3 \ 1] + [8 \ 2 \ 4] + [9 \ 4 \ 5]}{4} = [8.25 \ 3.25 \ 3]$$
$$\mu_{2} = \frac{[8 \ 6 \ 8] + [5 \ 8 \ 5] + [3 \ 7 \ 2] + [2 \ 9 \ 3] + [1 \ 4 \ 4]}{5} = [3.8 \ 6.8 \ 4.4]$$

- Iterate
 - compute cluster means

 $\mu_1 = [8.25 \ 3.25 \ 3]$

 $\mu_2 = [3.8 \ 6.8 \ 4.4]$

reassign samples to the closest mean





dist($\begin{bmatrix} 9 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ - $\begin{bmatrix} 8.25 & 3.25 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$) = $(8.25-9)^2 + (3.25-4)^2 + (3-2)^2 \approx 2$ [9 4 2] goes dist($\begin{bmatrix} 9 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ - $\begin{bmatrix} 3.8 & 6.8 & 4.4 \end{bmatrix}$) = $(3.8-9)^2 + (6.8-4)^2 + (4.4-2)^2 \approx 41$ to pink cluster

- Iterate
 - compute cluster means

 $\mu_1 = [8.25 \ 3.25 \ 3]$

 $\mu_2 = [3.8 \ 6.8 \ 4.4]$

- reassign samples to the closest mean
 - repeat for

[7 3 1] [8 6 8]

- **[8 2 4] [5 8 5] [3 7 2]**
- **[9 4 5] [2 9 3] [1 4 4]**
- Converged after one iteration
 - for larger images, usually 10-20 iterations enough for convergence



initial clustering





k = 3





K-means Properties

• Works best when clusters are spherical (blob like)



- Fails for elongated clusters
 - **J**_{SEE} is not an appropriate objective function in this case

• Sensitive to outliers

K-means Summary

- Advantages
 - Principled (objective function) approach to clustering
 - Simple to implement
 - Fast
- Disadvantages
 - Only a local minimum is found
 - May fail for non-blob like clusters
 - Sensitive to initialization
 - Sensitive to choice of *k*
 - Sensitive to outliers

Back to FG Segmentation: Improving Data Term



user strokes

initial result

- Can improve segmentation with more user strokes
- But can we get a better initial result?
- We are not using color information in the image effectively

FG Segmentation: Improving Data Term



- Data terms are 0 for most pixels
 - no preference to either foreground or background
- However
 - background strokes are mostly green
 - foreground strokes are mostly grey
- Can we push green non-seed pixels to prefer **background**?
- Can we push grey non-seed pixels to prefer **foreground**?

FG Segmentation: Improving Data Term



Currently have:	
$D_{\rm p}(0) = 0$	
$D_{0}(1) = 0$	
۲	
$\boldsymbol{D}_{q}\left(0 ight)=0$	
$D_{q}(1) = 0$	

Want to have:

 $D_p(0) = \text{small}$ $D_p(1) = \text{large}$

 $D_q(0) = \text{large}$ $D_q(1) = \text{small}$

FG Segmentation: Color Distributions

• Build color *distribution* from foreground seeds





• Build color *distribution* from background seeds



FG Segmentation: Color Distributions

• Build color *distribution* from foreground seeds





• Build color *distribution* from background seeds



• Normalized histogram for distribution

 $P_{\text{foreground}}(\text{color}) = \frac{\text{number of foreground seeds of color}}{\text{total number of foreground seeds}}$
FG Segmentation: Color Distributions

- For green pixels *p*, *P*_{background}(*p*) is high, *P*_{background}(*p*) low
- We want just the opposite for the data term
- Convert to "opposite" using -log()



• Do the same for the foreground



FG Segmentation: Color Distributions



- $D_{p}(\text{foreground}) = -\log P_{\text{foreground}}(\text{color of } p)$
- $D_p(background) = -\log P_{background}(color of p)$
- Problem
- The number of colors is too high: 256³
 - too large to build a normalized histogram
- Cluster colors using kmeans clustering, and treat each cluster as the "new" color

FG Segmentation: Cluster Colors

- Need to reduce number of colors
- Group similar colors together and treat the group as the same color
- 10 color clusters with kmeans
 - cluster 1 = color 1
 - cluster 2 = color 2
 - ...
 - cluster 10 = color 10
- Now we only have 10 colors
- Build foreground/background color models over 10 "new" colors



clusters visualized with random colors



pixels painted with average color of pixels in its cluster

Example

 In matlab, use kmeans([R(:),G(:),B(:)]) to get kmeans clustering, where R,G,B are image color channels

image with seeds



9

• Foreground histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	0	2	1

9

4

5

• Normalized F-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	0	2/3	1/3

1	1	1
1	2	2
1	2	3

kmeans

Background histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	2	0	0

Normalized B-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	2/2	0	0



Normalized F-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	0	2/3	1/3

• Foreground data cost (-log histF)

color index	1	2	3
count	8	0.4	1.1

Normalized B-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	2/2	0	0

• Background data cost (-log histB)

color index	1	2	3
count	0	8	8

- Do not want infinity costs
- Problem? Zero counts in histogram
- Smooth histogram by adding 1 to every bin count

Example

Foreground histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	0	2	1

Smoothed F-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	1	3	2

• Normalized F-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	1/6	3/6	2/6

Foreground data cost (-log histF)

color index	1	2	3
count	1.8	0.7	1.1

Background histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	2	0	0

Smoothed B-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	3	1	1

Normalized B-histogram

color index	1	2	3
count	3/5	1/5	1/5

• Background data cost (-log histB)

color index	1	2	3
count	0.5	1.6	1.6

FG Segmentation: Segmentation Result



reduced colors

user input



background D

blue pixels prefer foreground red pixels prefer background

segmentation

foreground D