Course Code:CSE499B
Section:20
Group:04

Ahmed Sadman
2014094042
Department of ECE
ahmed.sadman@northsouth.edu

Tawhid Islam
2021499042 Department of ECE
tawhid.islam@northsouth.edu

Muhaiminul Hasasn Dihan
2111208642 Department of ECE
muhaiminul.dihan@northsouth.edu

Alamin Sheikh Naim
2013556642 Department Of ECE
alamin.naim@northsouth.edu

Weekly Updates 9th March

I. Introduction

Point cloud processing is essential to applications like autonomous driving, robotics, and 3D scene reconstruction. Point cloud segmentation and classification can be improved in accuracy, efficiency, and speed through various techniques. In this report, a comparison of four of the popular techniques, i.e., RandLA-Net, KPConv, and PointCNN, is presented. These techniques are compared on the basis of three important performance measures—overall accuracy, mean Intersection over Union (mIoU), and processing speed.The result recognizes KPConv as most accurate, with RandLA-Net proving to have greater segmentation performance and outstanding processing time. PointNet++ and PointCNN, though efficient, are surpassed by newer methods. The paper seeks to give perspective to the strengths and weaknesses of the methods in order to inform researchers and practitioners on the best approach to use in their application area, whether real-time processing or object classification at high accuracy

II. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for point cloud processing methods consist of comparison of accuracy, segmentation quality, and computational efficiency. Overall accuracy measures the performance of the model in terms of correctly classifying points, measuring its ability to distinguish between different objects in a point cloud. Mean Intersection over Union (mIoU) evaluates segmentation quality by comparing predicted object areas to actual object areas, verifying if the method is able to encode fine-grained structures. Processing speed is a measure of the feasibility of the approach for real-time use by the number of points it can process per second. The optimal approach in real-world applications is one with high accuracy, good segmentation performance, and good processing speed. KPConv is the most accurate, for instance, while RandLA-Net does best on segmentation and on speed. A comparison of these aspects indicates the applicability of a method to certain applications, i.e., autonomous navigation, robotics, or large-scale 3D mapping. The ultimate choice relies on the trade-off between accuracy, efficiency, and computational viability

III. Completing the Abstract

The evaluation of methods in point cloud processing reflects evident differences in compromises and strong points in RandLA-Net, PointCNN, and KPConv. KPConv has a best average accuracy rate at 90.2% and therefore has a best classification accuracy. RandLA-Net trails slightly behind in average accuracy rate at 88.0%, with a best segmentation and a best mIoU at 70.0% and has a best performance in being the quickest with a rate of over 10 million points per second. It therefore has a best application in real-time applications. PointCNN and PointNet++ have a moderate performance with a rate from 84.5% to 85.9% in average accuracy, but fall behind complex methods in segmentation and performance. PointCNN can perform at a rate of 2 million points per second, and PointNet++ at a rate of 1.3 million. RandLANet has a balance in performance and segmentation accuracy, and KPConv has a preference in applications with high precision required. It would therefore depend on application needs, balancing segmentation quality,
computational efficiency, and
..

IV. Method Descriptions

RandLA-Net* is designed for huge points cloud processing with segmentation performance and segmentation correctness being given utmost priority. It contains a lightweight network and random sampling to offer high performance with fast processing. It can handle over 10 million points in a single second and can thus be utilized in real-time
PointNet++* is a version of PointNet with hierarchal feature learning to capture local structure in a point cloud. It outperforms the predecessor in segmentation and accuracy, with a similarly low mIoU and processing rate (1.3M points/sec) to be competitive in high-scale applications.
KPConv (Kernel Point Convolution)* employs deformable convoluntional kernels to enhance feature learning and best overall rate of accuracy at 90.2%. It has high-precision classification capacity with low rate of processing (1M points/second) and thus isn't real-time friendly.
PointCNN* applies a multi-level convoluted approach to learn spatial relationships in a point cloud. It has good performance (85.9% accuracy) but trails behind RandLANet and KPConv in performance with a mIoU score of 57.3% and a rate of processing 2M points/second.

V. Performance

Each point cloud processing method has a combination of compromises between rate, correctness, and computational efficiency. The optimal rate of correctness for KPConv is 90.2% and therefore best suited to highclassification-demand applications. With a reduced rate of processing to 1M points/second, however, it's not best suited to real-time applications. RandLA-Net with a slightly reduced rate to 88.0% has optimal segmentation outcome with a score equal to mIoU as high as 70.0% and a record-breaking rate (>10M points/second). It's therefore best suited to real-time and high-volume applications like autonomous cars and robotics. PointCNN and PointNet++ have a mid-level segmentation outcome and rate and lag behind in terms of rate and therefore aren't competitive in high-efficiency applications. The key compromise to be made here is between rate and correctness—KPConv being best suited to high-detail classification and RandLA-Net being best suited to high-speed and high-volume processing. The method to be adopted would therefore depend upon balancing rate, segmentation capability, and computational possibility.

Method	mIoU (%)	Memory (GB)	Inference Speed (ms per frame)
RandLA-Net	50.3	0.5	95
PointNet++	20.1	1.1	480
SPG	17.4	1.3	1800
KPConv	58.8	11	1200
MinkowskiNet	58.5	5	600

Method	Overall Accuracy (%)	mIoU (%)	Speed (points/sec)
RandLA-Net	88.0	70.0	>10M
PointNet++	84.5	53.0	1.3M
KPConv	90.2	67.1	1M
PointCNN	85.9	57.3	2M

VI. Technology Evolution

Point cloud processing has evolved from initial neural network architectures to advanced convolutions-based methods. **PointNet** being the pioneering method suggested a deep learning architecture that could handle unordered sets of points. It lacked local pattern capture and was therefore replaced by **PointNet++** that implemented hierarchical feature learning to achieve improved segmentation and classification.The next was with **PointCNN**, which utilized a convolutional method to improve spatial relationship learning with improved accuracy compared to earlier methods. It was still constrained in segmentation efficiency and accuracy. **KPConv** brought in deformable kernel-based convolutions with a radical boost in classification accuracy due to geometrical details being better captured. Computational efficiency was still a problem in spite of that.The latest innovation, RandLA-Net, optimized performance via random sampling and a lightweight network design. The innovation accelerated processing without compromising high accuracies, and it optimally serves real-time high-volume applications such as autonomous cars and robots

VII. Use Case Recommendations

RandLA-Net is best suited to real-time applications like autonomous cars and robots because it offers a high rate of processing and strong segmentation performance. It can effectively handle huge point cloud data and thus best suited to applications with a high demand for quick and correct environmental perception. KPConv, with best accuracy in a general sense, would be best suited to applications with high-precision object classification, e.g., in health imaging, cultural heritage preservation, and quality inspection in industries. RandLA-Net, again, best suited to huge 3D scene segmentation with a combination of high segmentation performance and high-speed performance and thus best suited to applications like urban mapping, forest monitoring, and infrastructure inspection. PointNet++ and PointCNN, being lightweight in nature, can be best suited to small-scale applications or in a situation with a demand for backward compatibility with a system. These algorithms can be best suited to research, learning, and simple augmented reality applications with a moderate level of required correctness. It would be a matter of a particular application's demand in terms of correctness, speed, and scalability

VIII. Conclusion

The comparison between different methods for processing points shows each method's merits and compromises and gives useful insight into choosing the best method in accordance with application requirements. RandLA-Net proves to be the best method for real-time applications with high processing speed and high segmentation quality and can be best suited for application in autonomous cars, robotics, and high-level 3D scene assembly. KPConv with highest total accuracy can be best suited to high-precision applications like medical imaging and industrial quality inspection due to low processing speed. PointCNN and PointNet++ fall behind more recent methods and can be best suited to small-scale applications or in a situation with a required compatibility with a legacy system. The history of methods for processing points shows a trend in balancing segmentation quality, accuracy, and computational efficiency. The method to be applied finally always relies on the application's particular requirements, whether it be for speed, accuracy, or segmentation performance.

REFRENCES:

1. *https://github.com/QingyongHu/RandLANet/blob/master/helper_ply.py*
2. *https://github.com/yangyanli/PointCNN*
3. *https://github.com/HuguesTHOMAS/KPConv-PyTorch*
4. *https://github.com/WangYueFt/dgcnn*
5. *https://github.com/charlesq34/pointnet*