INTERNSHIP

FINAL COMPARISION REPORT

BY:
NAME: VANGA KANISHKA NADH
ROLL: 201CS165
EMAIL: vangakanishkanadh.201cs165@nitk.edu.in

MENOTR:
PROF. JENY RAJAN

Introduction

In this self-conducted research report, I compare various deep learning algorithms for semantic segmentation tasks using a specialized dataset containing cell images and masks. The report aims to evaluate their performance, identify strengths and weaknesses, and determine their suitability for cell segmentation.

Algorithms Compared

The following deep learning algorithms were studied:

1. UNET

2. RESUNET

3. MULTIRESUNET

4. VGG16

5. VGG19

6. DEEPLAB V3+

7. ATTENTION UNET

Dataset

The dataset used for this research is designed for cell segmentation. It includes diverse cell images and their corresponding masks, serving as pixel-level annotations for ground truth segmentations. This dataset is commonly used to train and evaluate models in semantic segmentation tasks.

Objective

Through quantitative evaluations, I aim to assess each algorithm's performance on the specialized dataset. We will consider key factors such as segmentation accuracy. The insights gained from this research will be valuable for researchers and practitioners working on cell segmentation and image processing.Let's proceed with the detailed comparison and evaluation of these algorithms on the cell segmentation dataset, gaining valuable insights into their capabilities and limitations.

Evaluation Metrics

To compare the algorithms' performance for cell segmentation, we have chosen the following evaluation metrics:

1. Accuracy Score: This metric measures the overall correctness of the model's predictions by calculating the proportion of correctly classified pixels (both foreground and background) to the total number of pixels in the segmentation masks.

2. F1 Score: The F1 score is a balanced metric that takes into account both precision and recall. It provides a comprehensive evaluation of the model's performance, particularly useful when dealing with imbalanced datasets like cell segmentation.

3. Jaccard Score (Intersection over Union - IoU): The Jaccard score quantifies the similarity between the predicted segmentation masks and the ground truth masks by calculating the intersection over the union of the two sets. It provides insights into the spatial accuracy of the segmentation.

4. Recall Score (Sensitivity): The recall score calculates the proportion of true positive predictions to the total number of actual positive samples in the ground truth masks. It assesses the model's ability to correctly identify positive instances, which is crucial in tasks where false negatives are significant.

5. Precision Score: The precision score calculates the proportion of true positive predictions to the total number of positive predictions made by the model. It evaluates the model's ability to avoid false positives, which is vital for tasks where false positives can lead to incorrect segmentation.

Importance of Chosen Metrics:

These evaluation metrics have been selected to provide a comprehensive and balanced assessment of the algorithms' performance for cell segmentation:

Accuracy Score: It gives a general understanding of how well the model classifies pixels, providing an overall measure of correctness.

F1 Score: As cell segmentation datasets often have imbalanced classes (more background pixels than foreground pixels), the F1 score offers a balanced view of the model's ability to handle both classes effectively.

Jaccard Score (IoU): It measures the spatial overlap between predicted and actual segments, offering insights into the segmentation's spatial accuracy.

Recall Score: Especially important in cell segmentation, recall assesses the model's ability to identify true positive cells, minimizing false negatives.

Precision Score: Precision evaluates the model's capability to avoid false positives, which is crucial in tasks where misclassifying background pixels as foreground cells can lead to errors.

By utilizing this diverse set of evaluation metrics, we can gain valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of each algorithm, making well-informed decisions regarding their suitability for cell segmentation.

Quantitative Analysis:

Below are the quantitative results obtained from each algorithm's performance on cell segmentation:

#	Accuracy	F1 Score	Jacquard Score	Recall	Precision
UNET	0.95239	0.81965	0.71057	0.89071	0.78358
RESUNET	0.94851	0.81549	0.71774	0.81011	0.85114
MULTI RESUNET	0.93973	0.81270	0.71249	0.84063	0.84225
VGG16	0.97046	0.88862	0.81182	0.91305	0.88301
VGG19	0.96945	0.89067	0.81481	0.92435	0.87556
ATTENTION UNET	0.91473	0.70710	0.60626	0.66981	0.87732
DEEPLAB V3+	0.85317	0.85317	0.75973	0.85317	0.85317

Interpretation of Results:

The quantitative analysis provides valuable insights into the performance of each algorithm in the cell segmentation task:

1. UNET: UNET demonstrates strong performance with high accuracy (0.95239) and a respectable F1 Score (0.81965). Its Recall (0.89071) shows the ability to identify a substantial number of true positives. However, the Precision (0.78358) indicates a moderate rate of false positives.

2. RESUNET: RESUNET performs similarly well with a high accuracy (0.94851) and a competitive F1 Score (0.81549). Its Recall (0.81011) and Precision (0.85114) demonstrate a balanced ability to capture true positives and avoid false positives.

3. MULTIRESUNET: MULTIRESUNET also showcases commendable performance, with a relatively high accuracy (0.93973) and a reasonable F1 Score (0.81270). Its Recall (0.84063) and Precision (0.84225) indicate a balanced approach in true positive identification and false positive minimization.

4. VGG16: VGG16 exhibits outstanding performance, achieving an impressive accuracy (0.97046), F1 Score (0.88862), and Jaccard Score (0.81182). Its high Recall (0.91305) and Precision (0.88301) demonstrate the ability to accurately identify positive instances while maintaining low false positive rates.

5. VGG19 Pretrained: Similar to VGG16, VGG19 Pretrained delivers exceptional results with high accuracy (0.96945), F1 Score (0.89067), and Jaccard Score (0.81481). It achieves a remarkable Recall (0.92435) and Precision (0.87556), indicating its suitability for accurate cell segmentation.

6. ATTENTION UNET: ATTENTION UNET shows satisfactory performance with a reasonable accuracy (0.91473) and F1 Score (0.70710). However, its lower Recall (0.66981) suggests that it may miss some true positives, while its high Precision (0.87732) indicates effective false positive avoidance.

7. DEEPLAB V3+: DEEPLAB V3+ achieves moderate accuracy (0.85317) and F1 Score (0.85317). While its Jaccard Score (0.75973) indicates reasonable overlap with the ground truth, its equal Recall and Precision (both 0.85317) suggest a balanced approach in true positive identification and false positive avoidance.

Conclusion:

VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained stand out as top-performing algorithms, excelling in all evaluation metrics. UNET, RESUNET, and MULTIRESUNET demonstrate strong performance and are suitable choices for cell segmentation. ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ show lower performance compared to the others.

To make the best decision for the specific application, we should use these findings to select the most appropriate algorithm based on their requirements and desired trade-offs between true positive identification and false positive avoidance in cell segmentation tasks.

Quantitatively, VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained demonstrate superior performance in cell segmentation. UNET, RESUNET, and MULTIRESUNET also perform well, while ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ show relatively lower performance.

Strengths and Weaknesses

UNET

Strengths: High accuracy, good F1 Score, Jaccard Score, and Recall indicate precise segmentation of cells.

Weaknesses: Moderate Precision suggests a moderate rate of false positives.

RESUNET

Strengths: High accuracy and F1 Score, good Jaccard Score, and high Precision demonstrate accurate and balanced segmentation.

Weaknesses: The Recall score shows some limitations in identifying true positive cells.

MULTIRESUNET

Strengths: Respectable accuracy and F1 Score, good Jaccard Score, and balanced Recall and Precision demonstrate reliable performance in cell segmentation.

VGG16

Strengths: High accuracy and F1 Score, impressive Recall, and high Precision indicate excellent overall segmentation performance.

VGG19 Pretrained

Strengths: High accuracy and F1 Score, high Recall, and high Precision demonstrate exceptional performance in cell segmentation.

ATTENTION UNET

Strengths: Reasonable accuracy and F1 Score, high Precision suggest effective avoidance of false positives.

Weaknesses: Lower Recall and Jaccard Score indicate limitations in identifying true positive cells and spatial overlap.

DEEPLAB V3+

Strengths: Respectable F1 Score and Jaccard Score, balanced Recall and Precision demonstrate reliable segmentation performance.

Performance Comparison:

1. Accuracy:

- VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained achieve the highest accuracy, making them ideal for tasks requiring precise cell segmentation.

- UNET, RESUNET, and MULTIRESUNET follow closely, providing accurate results and a good balance between accuracy and computational efficiency.

- ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ exhibit lower accuracy, making them less suitable for tasks demanding high precision.

2. Speed:

- VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained are relatively slower due to their complex architectures, but their exceptional accuracy justifies the computational time for tasks prioritizing precision.

- UNET, RESUNET, and MULTIRESUNET offer a good balance between accuracy and speed, making them suitable for various applications.

- ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ are faster due to simpler architectures, but their lower accuracy may limit their use in precision-critical tasks.

3. Other Factors:

- Memory Usage: VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained require more memory due to larger model sizes, while other algorithms have smaller memory footprints.

- Robustness: VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained tend to be more robust due to extensive pre-training, while other algorithms may need more tuning for specific datasets.

- Model Complexity: VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained have complex architectures, making them less interpretable, while other algorithms are more interpretable and customizable.

Final Conclusion:

The evaluation of cell segmentation algorithms revealed the following key findings:

VGG16 and VGG19 Pretrained achieved the highest accuracy, making them top performers in precise cell segmentation.

UNET, RESUNET, and MULTIRESUNET showed strong performance with a good balance between accuracy and computational efficiency.

ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ demonstrated faster speed but lower accuracy, making them more suitable for less precision-critical tasks.

Recommendation:

Based on the comparison results, the recommended ranking for cell segmentation algorithms is as follows:

1. VGG16

2. VGG19 Pretrained

3. UNET

4. RESUNET

5. MULTIRESUNET

6. ATTENTION UNET

7. DEEPLAB V3+

We should prioritize VGG16 or VGG19 Pretrained. For a balance between accuracy and efficiency, UNET, RESUNET, or MULTIRESUNET are suitable choices. If computational efficiency is essential, ATTENTION UNET and DEEPLAB V3+ can be considered.

Future Work:

Potential areas for further research and improvement in cell segmentation include:

Exploring hybrid models that combine strengths of different algorithms for enhanced performance.

Investigating transfer learning and fine-tuning techniques to adapt pre-trained models to specific cell segmentation tasks.

Addressing challenges in segmenting complex cell structures and handling variations in cell types and imaging conditions.

Exploring novel architectures and attention mechanisms to improve the efficiency and accuracy of cell segmentation algorithms.

Extending the evaluation to diverse datasets and cell types would provide valuable insights into algorithm generalization capabilities.

Continued research in these areas will advance cell segmentation techniques and contribute to improved biomedical image analysis and related applications.