

# Success or Failure? Analyzing Segmentation Refinement with Few-Shot Segmentation

Seonghyeon Moon\*  
Brookhaven National  
Laboratory

Haein Kong†  
Rutgers University

Muhammad Haris Khan‡  
Mohamed Bin Zayed  
University of Artificial  
Intelligence




Figure 1: Segmentation refinement is a critical stage that aims to improve the initial, coarse masks generated by segmentation algorithms. These refined masks are supposed to capture better details and contours of the target objects. In the segmentation refinement process, as shown in the Stage 1 result on the left, problems can occur when the refined mask results in post-processing failure. The existing segmentation refinement has major limitations in its inability to determine that refinement has failed because of non-existing ground truth information. We propose Judging from Support Set (JFS), which can determine whether the refined mask has better results than the previous coarse mask. In Stage 2, Support mask prediction 1 is the result obtained using a coarse mask, and support mask prediction 2 is the result obtained using a refined mask. The cases in Stage 2 show when the support mask prediction from the coarse mask performs better than the refined mask. Support mask prediction 1 closely matches the support mask. JFS can identify these cases by comparing the performance of coarse mask and refined mask in Stage 1 using FSS network. Therefore, we can identify whether segmentation refinement is successful or failed.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of segmentation refinement is to enhance the initial coarse masks generated by segmentation algorithms. The refined masks are expected to capture the details and contours of the target objects. Research on segmentation refinement has developed as a response to the need for high-quality initial masks. However, to our knowledge, no method has been developed that can determine the success of segmentation refinement. Such a method could ensure the reliability of segmentation in applications where the outcome of the segmentation is important, and fosters innovation in image processing technologies. To address this research gap, we propose JFS (Judging From Support-set), a method to identify the success of segmentation refinement leveraging a few-shot segmentation (FSS) model. The traditional goal of the problem in FSS is to find a target object in a query image utilizing target information given by a support set. However, in our proposed method, we use the FSS network in a novel way to assess the segmentation refinement. When there are two masks, a coarse mask and a refined mask from segmentation

refinement, these two masks become support masks. The existing support mask works as a ground truth mask to judge whether the quality of the refined segmentation is more accurate than the coarse mask. We first obtained a coarse mask and refined it using SEPL (SAM Enhanced Pseudo-Labels) to get the two masks. Then, these become input to FSS model to judge whether the post-processing was successful. JFS is evaluated on the best and worst cases from SEPL to validate its effectiveness. The results showed that JFS can determine whether the SEPL is a success or not.

**Index Terms:** Segmentation Refinement, Few-shot Segmentation.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Semantic segmentation, which involves labeling each pixel of an image with a semantic category, is widely used in numerous fields including medical imaging [28], semiconductor manufacturing [7], and autonomous driving [20]. Recent advancements in Deep Convolutional Neural Networks (DCNNs) and the availability of extensive pixel-level annotated data have significantly enhanced the effectiveness of semantic segmentation techniques [15, 1, 31]. However, still due to the complexity of generating high-quality masks directly, some prior research has focused on improving coarse masks generated by initial segmentation models. For example, previous works [11, 9] involve enhancing segmentation models with a module specifically designed for mask correction. Other segmentation refinement studies [29, 2, 22] adopt a model-agnostic approach,

\*e-mail: smoon@bnl.gov

†e-mail: haein.kong@rutgers.edu

‡e-mail: muhammad.haris@mbzuai.ac.ae

using only an image and its coarse segmentation as inputs for refinement. Likewise, segmentation refinement continues to develop through various methods.

Segmentation refinement can improve the initial segmentation (Fig. 1). However, it is important to note that segmentation refinement is not always successful and the best results can only be expected when selecting an appropriate refinement model that performs well on a specific task. This makes determining the success and failure of segmentation refinement important. If the success and failure of segmentation refinement can be monitored, it would help to identify the most effective refinement techniques and achieve the best semantic segmentation. However, in contrast to the rapid developments of segmentation refinement techniques, the method for identifying whether the refinement is successful has been understudied despite its potential importance and usefulness. To address this research gap, we propose a new method that can assess the success of segmentation refinement using a few-shot segmentation (FSS) network.

FSS is a method that aims to address the shortcomings of supervised learning segmentation models. Specifically, FSS segments the target object in a query image using a few support-set to reduce the cost and effort of obtaining vast amounts of data. The core idea of FSS has the potential to be applied to the process of segmentation refinement, especially for offering a step that analyzes the quality of refinement tasks. In this step, the query image and two segmentation masks (coarse and refinement mask) can work as a support set in FSS network while the support image takes the role of a query image. This approach allows the error analysis between the support mask and the prediction from each segmentation mask. The results can serve as strong evidence to determine the quality of refinement segmentation. Based on this idea, we proposed a new method that can determine whether the segmentation refinement process was successful by utilizing a support set and query image inversely from the conventional FSS approach (Fig. 2). This study contributes to the field of segmentation refinement by offering a novel way of analyzing the quality of refinement masks.

To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to introduce a method of using the FSS model for analyzing the segmentation refinement process. Our method is named JFS (**J**udging **F**rom **S**upport-**S**et) in the sense that it uses information from the support set in the FSS to determine the success of the refinement. Our proposed method can determine whether segmentation refinement was successful or failed. We summarize our key contributions as follows:

- We proposed JFS, which leverages the FSS network to evaluate segmentation refinement. We believe this is the first method to determine the success of segmentation refinement.
- We verify the effectiveness of our proposed method by combining JFS with the SAM Enhanced pseudo-label (SEPL) pipeline on worst and best cases in PASCAL [4].

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Segmentation Refinement

Segmentation refinement aims to improve the quality of masks generated by existing segmentation models. There are two main approaches to segmentation refinement: model-specific methods and model-agnostic methods. Model-specific methods involve designing algorithms that are tailored to a specific type of model. For instance, PointRend [11] and MaskTransfuser [9] are examples of model-specific methods. PointRend [11] conducts point-based segmentation predictions at dynamically chosen locations using an iterative subdivision algorithm. MaskTransfuser [9] constructs a quadtree from the sparse, incoherent regions within the RoI pyramid, and subsequently refines all the tree nodes collectively using a refinement transformer that incorporates quadtree attention. Unlike




Figure 2: (a) The goal of conventional few-shot segmentation is to find the target object in the query image when a support set is given. (b) When there are a coarse mask and a refined mask, we can use the FSS network and support-set to prove that the refinement process is successful. Query image, segmentation masks (Coarse mask prediction and refined prediction), and support-set used for deciding the success of refinement segmentation. Note: In this figure, the error analysis for a refined mask is only visualized.

model-specific methods, model-agnostic methods are more versatile in that they can refine masks from various models. For example, SegFix [29] utilized boundary loss and direction loss separately on the predicted boundary map and direction map, respectively. BPR [22] extracts and enhances a series of boundary patches along the predicted instance boundaries using a powerful refinement network. SEPL [2] employs CAM pseudo-labels as indicators to identify and merge SAM masks, producing high-quality pseudo-labels that are aware of both class and object. Segmentation refinement techniques have been widely used to enhance coarse masks. However, there has been no method that can identify the effectiveness of post-processing in improving initial segmentation. This study aims to address this research gap by proposing a new method, JFS.

### 2.2 Few-shot Segmentation

Few-shot segmentation (FSS) aims to accurately segment a target object in a query image using a limited number of annotated examples called support-set. FSS was introduced by Shaban et al. [21]. Since then, many different methods have been attempted to improve FSS performance. The CANet [30] enhanced performance through iterations and cosine similarity adjustments, while PFENet [23] and PANet [25] focused on improving segmentation quality with pyramid modules and prototype networks, respectively. The other methods like PPNNet [14] and PMM [27] leveraged detailed object features and multiple prototypes for accuracy. AS-GNet [12] introduced modules for better prototype extraction and allocation, and DAN [24] focused on improving support and query image correspondence. ASNet [8] utilized an integrative framework for few-shot learning, HSNet [17] proposed 4D convolution for feature analysis, and VAT [5] proposed transformer-based network for modeling dense semantic correspondence. Various studies are continuously being conducted to improve FSS accuracy, but to our knowledge, there is no previous research that uses FSS to determine whether segment refinement is successful.

## 3 METHODOLOGY

The overall process of JFS is depicted in Fig. 3. Initially, it is necessary to locate the target object using a segmentation model to get

a coarse mask prediction. At this point, we aim to find a coarse segmentation rather than to obtain a precise segmentation of the object. This is followed by the SAM Enhanced Pseudo-Labels (SEPL) [2] refinement process. During the refinement, the use of a robust Segmentation model, SAM [10], allows for the acquisition of a more accurate segmentation mask of the object. However, whether the refined result is more accurate than the original prediction is questionable. The final step of our method aims to address this issue. Specifically, we propose utilizing the FSS model to determine whether the refined segmentation is successful or failed. The method we propose is divided into two stages: (1) Coarse mask and Refinement and (2) Judging from support set. This initial stage focuses on generating a preliminary segmentation mask, termed the ‘coarse mask’. Subsequently, this mask undergoes a refinement process to enhance its accuracy and detail, resulting in a ‘refined mask’. The second stage involves evaluating the refined mask using a support set. This set consists of additional data or examples that assist in assessing the effectiveness and precision of the segmentation mask prediction. These stages will be elaborated upon in the following discussion.

### 3.1 Stage 1: Coarse Mask and Refinement

We utilized CAM [13] for generating a coarse mask and the generated coarse mask is refined using SEPL [2]. Coarse masks generated by CAM recognize distinct, class-specific regions but often miss precise object boundaries. The accuracy of the proposed method can improve as the difference between the refined mask and coarse mask increases. Therefore, we do not expect an accurate coarse mask. To get a refined mask, we utilized SEPL which improves the quality of coarse mask by using a strong segmentation tool, the Segment Anything Model (SAM) [10]. Because SAM can accurately segment most parts or objects regardless of their class, SEPL can produce a high-quality segmentation mask. For one image, SEPL takes input coarse mask  $[M_1^c, \dots, M_k^c]$  and SAM masks  $[S_0, \dots, S_L]$  and outputs refined masks  $[M_1^r, \dots, M_k^r]$ . This process involves two steps: mask assignment and mask selection. In the stage of mask assignment, SEPL calculates the intersection of each SAM mask  $S_l$  with coarse mask  $M_k^c$  for each class  $k$  from 1 to  $k$ . Each mask  $S_l$  is allocated to the class it overlaps with the most, while masks with no overlap are discarded.

### 3.2 Stage 2: Judging from Support Set

From this stage, we will determine whether the polishing process is successful or not using the Alg. 1 (Fig 3). Two masks generated from stage 1, the coarse mask  $M^c$  and the refined mask  $M^r$ , query image  $I^q$  (Original image used to create the coarse mask), support image  $I^s$ , and support mask  $M^s$  are input to JFS. We tried to avoid using the same image from PASCAL [4] since query images are from PASCAL. Thus, the support image  $I^s$  was taken from images freely available on Wikimedia Commons for each class. We selected images where only one object was visible for each class. The support image should contain the same class object in the query image. The support mask was obtained using the SAM segmentation method. All these inputs go to SegGPT [26] which shows the best performance in the FSS task to get accurate support mask prediction (SMP). We get  $SMP^1$  and  $SMP^2$  from  $M^c$  and  $M^r$  respectively. We can obtain the IoU value by comparing the results of SMP and the  $M^s$  using Eq. 1. The larger the IoU value, the more similar it is to the  $M^s$ . When E1 is greater than E2, it means split segmentation. Conversely, if the E2 value is greater than E1, it indicates success.

$$E1 = \frac{SMP^1 \cap M^s}{SMP^1 \cup M^s}, \quad E2 = \frac{SMP^2 \cap M^s}{SMP^2 \cup M^s} \quad (1)$$

Note that although SEPL [2] generally improves segmentation quality, it has drawbacks from three sources: when a coarse mask fails to

### Algorithm 1: JFS: Judging from Support Set

**Input** : Query Image  $I^q$ , Coarse Mask  $M^c$ , Refined Mask  $M^r$ , Support Image  $I^s$ , Support Mask  $M^s$   
Generate two sets of data A and B  
 $A = \{I^q, M^c, I^s\}$ ,  $B = \{I^q, M^r, I^s\}$   
Both  $I^q, M^c$  and  $I^q, M^r$  behave as Support-set role and  $I^s$  becomes a query image in FSS  
Get Support Mask Prediction  $SMP^1$  from A and  $SMP^2$  from B using FSS network (SegGPT)  
Calculate IoU comparing  $SMP^1$ ,  $SMP^2$  with  $M^s$   
**Output**: IoU scores for  $SMP^1$  and  $SMP^2$




Figure 3: Overview of JFS. JFS uses support mask  $M^s$  as ground truth to determine which mask prediction is closer to the ground truth. If the IoU value of E1 is greater than E2, segmentation refinement has failed. Conversely, if the IoU value of E2 is greater than E1, segmentation refinement has succeeded.

activate a target object, when the SAM fails to detect a target object, and the algorithm itself tends to have a large segment. These fail to improve segmentation quality from coarse masks and SEPL itself does not provide any information if refined masks have a worse quality mask than coarse masks.

### 3.3 Experiment

**Datasets:** We used the worst and best cases in SEPL [2] on PASCAL [4] and determined whether the refinement was a success or not based on the IoU metric. To avoid using the same image for the support set, we collected license-free images from Wikimedia Commons for one image per class.

**Evaluation metrics:** We compared support mask prediction performance with support mask using Intersection-over-Union (IoU) which is widely used in segmentation tasks [17, 8, 6, 18]. IoU calculates the overlap between the predicted region (mask) and the ground truth region (mask) of an object in an image, providing a measure of how accurately the predicted mask aligns with the ground truth mask.

**Implementation Details:** Coarse masks were created using TransCAM [13]. To refine a coarse mask, we utilized SEPL [2] method. All SAM [10] masks used in SEPL [2] were generated using the pre-trained model (VIT [3]-H) shared on the SAM official site. Seg-




Figure 4: Support mask prediction 2 ( $SMP^2$ ), which is closer to the ground truth’s support mask  $M^s$ , is the result of more accurate segmentation of the target object in Stage 1 using SegGPT. This shows how JFS works when segmentation refinement is successful.

GPT was used for the FSS model, and the pre-trained model (ViT large) was used without fine-tuning.

#### 4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Qualitative results:** Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 show that JFS can determine failure and success respectively in the segmentation refinement process. Therefore, if the segmentation refinement fails, we can return to the existing coarse mask and consider another segmentation refinement method.

**How JFS works?:** We found that most FSS networks [21, 30, 23, 12, 14, 24, 16, 17, 8, 6, 18, 19] rely on support set information to find target objects in the query image (Fig. 2). Therefore, it was found that FSS performance deteriorates when the support mask information is inaccurate [18, 19]. If a refined mask accurately segments the target object, it provides more detailed texture information of the target to FSS model. Based on these ideas, we designed JFS. The closer mask of the target object is provided, the more accurately FSS will segment the target object in a query image. In particular, the JFS method was more effective in the following situations (Fig. 1 and Fig. 4). (a) When refined masks are very accurate at the boundary area. We found that the more accurately the edges of the target object in the refined mask were segmented, the better the support mask prediction was at distinguishing the target object from the background. (b) Where the difference between coarse mask and refined mask is noticeable. If an object other than the target object exists in the refined mask, this confuses about which object should be segmented to the FSS model, causing the accuracy of support mask prediction to drop significantly. Therefore, it was clearer that the refined mask had failed. (c) When the query image and support-set have the same class object in the background. If the coarse mask or refined mask segments the target object and an object in the background, FSS models recognize this information as target information and attempt to segment it together if a similar object exists in the support image.

**Limitation of JFS:** We observed that the JFS method has limitations in two cases (Fig. 5). (a) When the refined mask is not significantly different from the existing segmentation. It includes where the refined mask is slightly improved over the coarse mask or the refined mask has no major errors. In this case, it is difficult to solely rely on the judgment of JFS since the values of E1 and E2 are similar. Therefore, JFS performs better in deciding on cases where the

refined mask shows a significant difference from the coarse mask. (b) When both the refined mask and the coarse mask share the key feature of the object. FSS networks are designed to find a target object even if they have little target information. Therefore, support mask predictions from the two masks are similar. The results of JFS need to be carefully considered for these two cases.




Figure 5: Failure cases. When the refined mask and coarse mask cover the same key features on the same target object, support mask prediction yields very similar results. This is because FSS models are trained to find a target even with small key features from support-set. JFS failed to decide accurately whether the refinement process was successful or failed.

#### 5 CONCLUSION

We proposed JFS, a new method to determine the success of the segmentation refinement process. In this paper, we showed that JFS can identify the success and failure cases in SEPL segmentation refinement. The identification of successful refinement can be used in multiple application scenarios, which can result in improved segmentation quality. In addition, JFS provides a new perspective in both of few-shot segmentation and segmentation refinement by utilizing FSS for a different purpose from the previous research. However, we acknowledge that JFS performs worse in several cases and there is room for further development. It is expected to obtain improved results by fine-tuning FSS models or modifying the models for the JFS purpose in future research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L.-C. Chen, G. Papandreou, I. Kokkinos, K. Murphy, and A. L. Yuille. DeepLab: Semantic Image Segmentation with Deep Convolutional Nets, Atrous Convolution, and Fully Connected CRFs. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (TPAMI)*, 40(4):834–848, 2018. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2017.2699184 **1**
- [2] T. Chen, Z. Mai, R. Li, and W. lun Chao. Segment anything model (sam) enhanced pseudo labels for weakly supervised semantic segmentation, 2023. **1, 2, 3**
- [3] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale, 2021. **3**
- [4] M. Everingham, L. Van Gool, C. Williams, J. Winn, and A. Zisserman. The Pascal Visual Object Classes (VOC) challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, 88:303–338, 06 2010. doi: 10.1007/s11263-009-0275-4 **2, 3**
- [5] S. Hong, S. Cho, J. Nam, and S. Kim. Cost Aggregation Is All You Need for Few-Shot Segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11685*, 2021. **2**
- [6] S. Hong, S. Cho, J. Nam, S. Lin, and S. Kim. Cost Aggregation with 4D Convolutional Swin Transformer for Few-Shot Segmentation. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022. **3, 4**
- [7] S.-H. Huang and Y.-C. Pan. Automated visual inspection in the semiconductor industry: A survey. *Computers in Industry*, 66:1–10, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.compind.2014.10.006 **1**
- [8] D. Kang and M. Cho. Integrative Few-Shot Learning for Classification and Segmentation. In *Proceedings of IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. **2, 3, 4**
- [9] L. Ke, M. Danelljan, X. Li, Y.-W. Tai, C.-K. Tang, and F. Yu. Mask transfiner for high-quality instance segmentation, 2021. **1, 2**
- [10] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick. Segment anything, 2023. **3**
- [11] A. Kirillov, Y. Wu, K. He, and R. Girshick. Pointrend: Image segmentation as rendering, 2020. **1, 2**
- [12] G. Li, V. Jampani, L. Sevilla-Lara, D. Sun, J. Kim, and J. Kim. Adaptive Prototype Learning and Allocation for Few-Shot Segmentation. In *Proceedings of IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. **2, 4**
- [13] R. Li, Z. Mai, Z. Zhang, J. Jang, and S. Sanner. Transcam: Transformer attention-based cam refinement for weakly supervised semantic segmentation. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, p. 103800, 2023. **3**
- [14] Y. Liu, X. Zhang, S. Zhang, and X. He. Part-aware prototype network for few-shot semantic segmentation, 2020. **2, 4**
- [15] J. Long, E. Shelhamer, and T. Darrell. Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 3431–3440. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, jun 2015. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298965 **1**
- [16] Z. Lu, S. He, X. Zhu, L. Zhang, Y.-Z. Song, and T. Xiang. Simpler is Better: Few-shot Semantic Segmentation with Classifier Weight Transformer. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. **4**
- [17] J. Min, D. Kang, and M. Cho. Hypercorrelation Squeeze for Few-Shot Segmentation. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 6941–6952, 2021. **2, 3, 4**
- [18] S. Moon, S. S. Sohn, H. Zhou, S. Yoon, V. Pavlovic, M. H. Khan, and M. Kapadia. HM: Hybrid Masking for Few-Shot Segmentation. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pp. 506–523, 2022. **3, 4**
- [19] S. Moon, S. S. Sohn, H. Zhou, S. Yoon, V. Pavlovic, M. H. Khan, and M. Kapadia. Msi: Maximize support-set information for few-shot segmentation, 2023. **4**
- [20] K. Muhammad, T. Hussain, H. Ullah, J. D. Ser, M. Rezaei, N. Kumar, M. Hijji, P. Bellavista, and V. H. C. de Albuquerque. Vision-based semantic segmentation in scene understanding for autonomous driving: Recent achievements, challenges, and outlooks. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(12):22694–22715, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2022.3207665 **1**
- [21] A. Shaban, S. Bansal, Z. Liu, I. Essa, and B. Boots. One-Shot Learning for Semantic Segmentation. In *Proceedings of British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)*, pp. 167.1–167.13, 2017. doi: 10.5244/C.31.167 **2, 4**
- [22] C. Tang, H. Chen, X. Li, J. Li, Z. Zhang, and X. Hu. Look closer to segment better: Boundary patch refinement for instance segmentation, 2021. **1, 2**
- [23] Z. Tian, H. Zhao, M. Shu, Z. Yang, R. Li, and J. Jia. Prior Guided Feature Enrichment Network for Few-Shot Segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (TPAMI)*, 2020. **2, 4**
- [24] H. Wang, X. Zhang, Y. Hu, Y. Yang, X. Cao, and X. Zhen. Few-Shot Semantic Segmentation with Democratic Attention Networks. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pp. 730–746, 2020. **2, 4**
- [25] K. Wang, J. H. Liew, Y. Zou, D. Zhou, and J. Feng. PANet: Few-Shot Image Semantic Segmentation With Prototype Alignment. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. **2**
- [26] X. Wang, X. Zhang, Y. Cao, W. Wang, C. Shen, and T. Huang. Seggpt: Segmenting everything in context, 2023. **3**
- [27] B. Yang, C. Liu, B. Li, J. Jiao, and Y. Qixiang. Prototype Mixture Models for Few-shot Semantic Segmentation. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020. **2**
- [28] W. Yao, J. Bai, W. Liao, Y. Chen, M. Liu, and Y. Xie. From cnn to transformer: A review of medical image segmentation models, 2023. **1**
- [29] Y. Yuan, J. Xie, X. Chen, and J. Wang. Segfix: Model-agnostic boundary refinement for segmentation, 2020. **1, 2**
- [30] C. Zhang, G. Lin, F. Liu, R. Yao, and C. Shen. CANet: Class-Agnostic Segmentation Networks With Iterative Refinement and Attentive Few-Shot Learning. In *Proceedings of IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. **2, 4**
- [31] H. Zhao, J. Shi, X. Qi, X. Wang, and J. Jia. Pyramid Scene Parsing Network. In *Proceedings of IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 6230–6239, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.660 **1**