

# PROMPTS

## 1. Initial Task Request

User requested a complete Group C pipeline including grayscale conversion, histogram computation, and mean-shift segmentation from scratch.

The requirement was strict adherence to the algorithm described in the PDF slides and Gonzalez.

Execution had to occur in one Colab cell, using only NumPy for segmentation.

## 2. First Model Output

The model produced an initial code scaffold combining OpenCV and matplotlib with a custom mean-shift block.

However, the segmentation logic diverged from the PDF, especially in merging and kernel update rules.

This caused unstable and inaccurate mode computation.

## 3. Grayscale / Histogram Stage

The grayscale conversion and histogram plotting components were implemented correctly from the beginning.

The user confirmed consistent behavior across Colab executions.

No corrections were required for this preprocessing stage.

## 4. Initial Mean-Shift Implementation Fault

The initial mean-shift algorithm suffered from incorrect window selection, incorrect kernel weighting, and omitted monotonicity enforcement.

It did not replicate the 1-D histogram-based mean-shift described in the slides.

As a result, the computed modes were unstable and did not reflect true brightness clusters.

## 5. User Flags Incorrect LUT

The user correctly observed that segmented images looked almost identical to the input grayscale image.

This indicated that intensity quantization was not happening at all.

The root cause was an LUT constructed solely from pruned modes rather than using the full  $m(x)$  mapping.

## 6. Corrected LUT Mapping

The model replaced the LUT logic with a nearest-mode mapping applied to each of the 256 intensity bins.

This used the full  $m(x)$  vector after monotonicity enforcement, producing correct bin-to-mode assignments.

Segmentation became piecewise-constant as expected.

## 7. Boundary Map Failure

The user then reported that the boundary map was entirely black.

This occurred because `connectedComponents()` treats all non-zero intensities as the same class.

Applied to a grayscale segmented image, it produced a single component.

## 8. Corrected Connected Components

The model corrected the issue by mapping each distinct mode intensity to a unique integer label  $0..K-1$ .

`Connected-components` was then executed on this region-indexed label map.

Boundary extraction using 4-connected neighbors produced valid contours.

## 9. Incorrect Attribution of Errors

The model initially blamed the image or algorithm limitations rather than its own implementation errors.

The user highlighted discrepancies between the PDF and the generated code.

The model acknowledged these corrections and revised its earlier statements.

## 10. Explanation of Failure Mechanisms

Upon user request, the model explained that poor segmentation arose from low histogram bandwidth and insufficient kernel smoothing.

This allowed minor histogram fluctuations to create many spurious modes.

Tuning  $h$  directly controlled histogram smoothing and peak stability.

## 11. Histogram Smoothing Fix

The model adopted larger bandwidth values ( $h \approx 40-60$ ) to suppress noise and small peaks.

This substantially improved mode convergence and region merging.

The approach aligned with the underlying kernel density estimation described in the slides.

## **12. Correct Mode Pruning**

Mode pruning was restructured using  $\text{support\_thresh} \approx 0.02$  and  $\text{gap\_thresh} \approx 15$ .

These parameters removed very weak modes and merged close peaks.

This restored the intended behavior of the PDF's support/gap pruning rules.

## **13. Consistency Across Images**

User required the segmentation pipeline to perform adequately across three different images: Pond, Orchid, and Campus.

These images displayed diverse textures, contrast levels, and histogram shapes.

The model analyzed each case to find common hyperparameter behavior.

## **14. Unified Parameter Set**

A robust parameter set was proposed:  $h = 40$ ,  $\text{gap\_thresh} = 15$ ,  $\text{support\_thresh} = 0.02$ .

These values achieved consistent mode clustering across all images.

Typical segmentation produced 3–6 modes, matching expected brightness groups.

## **15. Pipeline Breakage and Restore Request**

The user unintentionally modified multiple components—LUT, CC, and parameters—breaking the pipeline.

Segmentation and boundary images failed to render.

The user requested a return to the last functional version.

## **16. Restoration of Working Pipeline**

ChatGPT-Go reconstructed the last fully verified working version of the pipeline.

This included correct LUT mapping, connected-component labeling, and boundary extraction.

The final implementation executed cleanly in a single Colab cell.

## **17. Verification of Segmentation Purity**

The user checked unique intensity values in the segmented image.

Consistent presence of a few (< 6) distinct levels confirmed successful histogram clustering.

This verified that mean-shift and pruning were implemented correctly.

## **18. Boundary Extraction Success**

Boundary extraction operated correctly once labels were converted into discrete region indices. 4-connected neighborhood differences produced visible region outlines. This matched the assignment requirement for a bilevel boundary image.

## 19. Full Documentation Request

The user requested a detailed technical report summarizing the full debugging process.

The model produced concise and extended versions of the documentation.

The report captured both erroneous steps and their corrections.

## 20. Final Conclusion

Through systematic user-guided debugging, the segmentation pipeline was made fully consistent with the PDF and Gonzalez.

Errors in LUT, connected components, bandwidth, and pruning were identified and resolved.

The final single-cell solution satisfied the full Group C specification for all images.

---

## Observations

1. **User provided the official Mean-Shift slides, ensuring that the model's corrections were grounded directly in the expected academic definition.**  
After upgrading from ChatGPT-Free to ChatGPT-Go, the user observed significantly more reliable reasoning, tighter adherence to theoretical requirements, and more accurate corrections.
2. **The user was highly vigilant in detecting deviations from the PDF, particularly in mode merging, LUT construction, and connected-components logic.**  
These deviations caused major segmentation failures.  
The user's repeated testing with real outputs allowed rapid identification of these implementation errors.
3. **The correctness of the algorithm became evident only after all three components—full  $m(x)$  LUT, proper pruning, and correct CC—were simultaneously fixed.**  
Each fix on its own improved behavior but did not restore full correctness until the entire pipeline was aligned with the PDF.
4. **Pond.jpg revealed algorithmic limitations due to extremely low contrast and overlapping intensity distributions.**  
Even with correct implementation, the segmentation was weaker because the histogram

had few separable peaks.

This is a known limitation of 1-D histogram-based mean-shift compared to spatial-range mean-shift.

5. **Hyperparameters h (bandwidth), gap\_thresh (mode merging), and support\_thresh (mode strength) control histogram smoothing and cluster granularity.**

Increasing h merges intensity clusters; decreasing support\_thresh allows more minor modes; increasing gap\_thresh merges nearby peaks more aggressively.

Proper tuning is essential for each image, but the chosen unified set performed reasonably across all datasets.

6. **ChatGPT-Go's corrections demonstrated much stronger theoretical alignment and debugging ability than ChatGPT-Free.**

With the upgraded model, the user achieved stable segmentation, correct CC, and valid boundary maps, meeting the full Group C assignment specifications.