CVPR
#0947

CVPR
#0947

CVPR 2017 Submission #0947. CONFIDENTIAL REVIEW COPY. DO NOT DISTRIBUTE.

Guided Proofreading of Automatic Segmentations for Connectomics

Thank you for your constructive comments. We will fix all minor issues. We would like to clarify the following major remarks.

1. Quantitative Evaluation

Reviewer 2 requests an objective quantitative evaluation. We define such experiments in lines 573-590 and report the results in Fig. 6, Fig. 7 and lines 792-818 (also in supplemental Sec. 2 and 3). The evaluation is fully numeric and we report VI scores. We will change the wording in the manuscript to emphasize this.

2. Reproducibility

Reviewer 2 expresses concerns regarding reproducibility. However, we define all parameters in the manuscript and promise to release code and data (line 847).

3. Optimal Parameters

We define several parameters in the paper. However, we agree with reviewer 2 that finding the optimal values could be better explained and will synchronize this information with the paper. The **threshold** $p_t = 0.95$ was observed to be stable when evaluating on previously unseen testing data (lines 585-586, supplemental Sec. 1.3). The **input border is dilated by 5 pixels** to consider slight edge ambiguities and to cover extra-cellular space between segments in high-resolution electron microscopy data (lines 308-310). During merge error detection, **labels are dilated by 20 pixels** prior to finding potential borders (line 323) with border-seeded watershed—this way the borders tend to attach to real membrane boundaries (lines 364-366).

4. Training Datasets U-net vs. GP

Reviewer 3 raises the question if GP was trained on the same data as membrane detection (U-net). There was no overlap (Tab. 1).

Table 1: Training data of membrane detection vs. training data of GP (for supplemental material).

Dataset	Training Set Membrane Detection (U-Net)	Training Set Guided Proofreading
L. Cylinder	AC3+AC4 $(1024 \times 1024 \times 175 \text{vx})$	L. Cylinder $(2048 \times 2048 \times 250 \text{vx})$
AC4 subvolume	AC4 excl. test $(1024 \times 1024 \times 90 \text{vx})$	L. Cylinder $(2048 \times 2048 \times 250 \text{vx})$
CREMI A/B/C	AC3+AC4 $(1024 \times 1024 \times 175 \text{vx})$	CREMI A/B/C $(1250 \times 1250 \times 300 \text{vx})$

5. Faster Proofreading

We agree with reviewer 2 that our results regarding faster proofreading with GP are not clearly presented. We will add Tab. 2 to the paper (previously reported in lines 756-765, slopes in figure 6, column 3 in figure 7) to better present our findings.

Table 2: Average proofreading speed for novice users of Dojo, FP and GP. Higher VI reduction per minute shows better performance of GP.

	Correction Time [s]	VI Reduction per minute
Dojo	30.5	-0.002
FP	4.9	0.00023
GP	6.2	0.00173

6. Merge Error Detection

Reviewer 3 suggests a better explanation of the merge error detection. We updated figure 4 in the paper to include the watershed seeds (Fig. 1). We will also add a pseudo code version of the algorithm to the supplemental material to promote understanding.


Figure 1: Updated figure 4 to include the random watershed seeds. (TODO)

7. GALA Active Learning Classifier

We use GALA in our automatic segmentation pipeline (line 499). GALA uses a random forest classifier to agglomerate segments. While it does not require user interaction, it requires parameters. We will either add a reference to our yet unpublished segmentation pipeline or add a section to the supplemental material describing it in more detail as requested by reviewer 3.

000
001
002
003
004
005
006
007
008
009
010
011
012
013
014
015
016
017
018
019
020
021
022
023
024
025
026
027
028
029
030
031
032
033
034
035
036
037
038
039
040
041
042
043
044
045
046
047
048
049
050
051
052
053

054
055
056
057
058
059
060
061
062
063
064
065
066
067
068
069
070
071
072
073
074
075
076
077
078
079
080
081
082
083
084
085
086
087
088
089
090
091
092
093
094
095
096
097
098
099
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107