000

001

002

003

004 005

006

007

008

009 010

011

012

013

037

038

039

040

041

042

043

044

045

046

053

3D Point Cloud Instance Segmentation of Lettuce Based on Adaptive DBSCAN

Anonymous ICCV submission

Paper ID 9

1. Introduction

Leaf instance segmentation plays a crucial role in obtaining plant phenotypic parameters [1]. Utilizing threedimensional (3D) images allows for a higher level of detail compared to two-dimensional (2D) images, making it highly significant for plant phenotype extraction. This abstract focuses on the research of lettuce, using 3D point clouds as the primary data form.

021 At present, a large number of studies have implemented 022 leaf instance segmentation and counting based on tradi-023 tional machine learning or deep learning algorithms [6, 4, 024 3, 5]. However, there are few unsupervised, adaptive and 025 simple instance segmentation algorithms for limited sam-026 ple dataset. DBSCAN (Density-Based Spatial Clustering of 027 Applications with Noise) is a density-based algorithm [2]. It is unsupervised and also can discover clusters of any ar-028 029 bitrary shape and size in datasets containing even noise and 030 outliers. However, DBSCAN is sensitive to the parameters 031 of Eps and MinPts, so it is important to improve the algo-032 rithm to achieve self-adaptation of the two parameters. In 033 this abstract, the idea of ANNA (Average Nearest Neigh-034 bor Analysis) and mathematic expectation are introduced to 035 improve DBSCAN. It aims to achieve self-adaptation of the 036 two important parameters Eps and MinPts of DBSCAN.

2. Proposed Method

Eps and MinPts of DBSCAN were dynamically selected according to the distribution characteristics of the lettuce point cloud dataset, so that the improved algorithm could better adapt to datasets with different densities and noise, improve the accuracy of instance segmentation. In order to improve the efficiency and accuracy of improved DBSCAN, downsampling 3D point cloud data at first.

ANNA first calculated the distance between the target
point and its nearest neighbor point, and then acquired the
average of all these nearest neighbor distances in order to
reflect the density of the data. Therefore, the idea of ANNA
was introduced to improve DBSCAN in order to determine
Eps. The steps of the algorithm are as follows:

(1) Calculate the Euclidean distance from each point to

all other points in the 3D point cloud dataset and form the distance matrix.

(2) Sort the calculated distance of each point.

(3) Calculate the average of distances with the same sort number (K) as the value list of Eps. The K represents the number of neighborhood points around the target point.

For the calculated list of Eps, traverse the distance matrix to find out the points whose distance was less than Eps and the mathematic expectation of the number of the points was calculated, then MinPts list was acquired. The formula is shown in formula (1). P_i represents the number of points whose distance was less than Eps of point i, and n is the number of point clouds in dataset.

$$MinPts = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \times P_i \tag{1}$$

3. Result and Discussion

Figure 1(a) and 1(b) showed the trend of Eps and MinPts with changing K. The Eps and MinPts of different K were input into DBSCAN to obtain the cluster number. When the generated cluster number was the same for many times, the cluster number was defined as the optimal clustering result, and the two parameters corresponding to the maximum K value in the stationary phase were used as the optimal parameters of DBSCAN. As shown in figure 1(c), when the value of K was 8, the cluster number was 8, and the clustering result began to enter a stationary phase until the value of K was 82. Therefore, the Eps and MinPts corresponding to K=82 were taken as the optimal parameters.

The segmentation effect was evaluated by accuracy and accuracy refers to the proportion of the correctly segmented and total number of point clouds. The accuracy was shown in Table 1. The accuracy of improved DBSCAN had been greatly increased.

Visualize the point cloud instance segmentation results in figure 2. When the number of leaves increased, DB-SCAN had serious segmentation errors and more noise points, and the segmentation accuracy could not be guaranteed. Because the improved DBSCAN found the optimal parameters, the segmentation accuracy was higher and noise 054 055 056

059 060 061

062

057

058

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



Figure 1. The trend of Eps, MinPts and Cluster number with K. (a) The values of Eps with different K. (b) The value of MinPts with different Eps and MinPts corresponding to K.

Methods	Average accuracy (%)
DBSCAN	80.91
Ours	91.80

Table 1. Comparison of DBSCAN and improved DBSCAN.

points were fewer. However, some parts of leaves were undivided when the occlusion was severe. On the whole, the segmentation results were within the acceptable range.



Figure 2. Instance segmentation results of lettuce. (a) 3D point cloud after downsampling. (b) Instance segmentation based on DBSCAN. (c) Instance segmentation based on ours.

The results of segmentation were taken as the number of leaves. As shown in figure 3(a), R^2 of DBSCAN was 0.637, and the correlation degree was weak. Figure 3(b) showed that R^2 of improved DBSCAN reached 0.940 with strong correlation, indicating that improved DBSCAN could realize leaf count of lettuce more accurately. Both MAE and RMSE were smaller when using improved DBSCAN.

4. Conclusion

In this abstract, our research contributes to the field of instance segmentation of lettuce leaves. We proposed an im-



Figure 3. The correlation degree between the estimated leaf number and ground truth. (a) Estimated result based on DBSCAN. (b) Estimated result based on ours.

proved DBSCAN algorithm for leaf instance segmentation, incorporating the concepts of ANNA and mathematical expectation to determine the crucial parameters, namely Eps and MinPts. By applying this algorithm, the accuracy of instance segmentation significantly increased from 80.91% to 91.80%. Moreover, we achieved an R^2 value of 0.940, indicating a strong correlation between the ground truth and the predicted leaf count. Our method provides valuable insights for nondestructive phenotype acquisition in lettuce research.

References

- Charlene M Grahn, Chris Benedict, Tom Thornton, and Carol Miles. Production of baby-leaf salad greens in the spring and fall seasons of northwest washington. *HortScience*, 50(10):1467–1471, 2015. 1
- [2] Kamran Khan, Saif Ur Rehman, Kamran Aziz, Simon Fong, and Sababady Sarasvady. Dbscan: Past, present and future. In *The fifth international conference on the applications of digital information and web technologies (ICADIWT 2014)*, pages 232–238, 2014. 1
- [3] Yinglun Li, Weiliang Wen, Teng Miao, Sheng Wu, Zetao Yu, Xiaodong Wang, Xinyu Guo, and Chunjiang Zhao. Automatic organ-level point cloud segmentation of maize shoots by integrating high-throughput data acquisition and deep learning. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 193:106702, 2022.

216	[4] Luhan Wang Libua Zheng and Minjuan Wang. 3d point	270
217	cloud instance segmentation of lettuce based on partnet. In	271
218	Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vi-	272
219	sion and Pattern Recognition, pages 1647–1655, 2022. 1	273
220	[5] Luhan Wang, Lihua Zheng, and Minjuan Wang. 3d point	274
221	cloud instance segmentation of lettuce based on partnet. In	275
222	Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vi-	276
223	sion and Pattern Recognition, pages 1647–1655, 2022. 1	277
224	[6] Lele Xu, Ye Li, Yuanyuan Sun, Lei Song, and Shan Jin. Leaf	278
225	instance segmentation and counting based on deep object de-	279
226	tection and segmentation networks. In 2018 Joint 10th Inter-	280
227	national Conference on Soft Computing and Intelligent Sys-	281
228	tems (SCIS) and 19th International Symposium on Advanced	282
229	Intelligent Systems (ISIS), pages 180–185, 2018. 1	283
230		284
231		285
232		286
233		287
234		288
235		289
236		290
237		200
238		292
239		293
240		294
241		295
242		206
243		200
240		202
244		230
245		200
240		300
247		202
240		202
249		204
250		205
201		305
202		207
200		307
204		300
200		309
200		310
207		311
258		312
259		313
260		314
201		315
262		310
203		317
264		318
265		319
266		320
267		321
268		322
269		323