Generative Adversarial Learning for Reducing Manual Annotation in Semantic Segmentation on Large Scale Microscopy Images

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$

Kumar Ayush B. Tech (Hons.) - Computer Science and Engineering

> Advisor Dr. Pabitra Mitra

Motivation



Labeling Data



Cheap and Abundant!



Human Expert/Special Equipment/Experiment





Expensive and Scarce!

Convolutional Neural Network(CNN) based semantic segmentation require extensive pixel level manual annotation which is daunting for large microscopic images.

Success of Generative Adversarial Networks

- Radford et al., have shown convincing evidence that unsupervised training of a deep convolutional adversarial pair learns a hierarchy of representations.
- They have demonstrated the applicability of these **rich image representations** for **supervised tasks** such as **CIFAR-10 classification**.

Reference : Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks. A. Radford, L. Metz, S. Chinatala. ICLR 2016



Success of Generative Adversarial Networks

- Augustus Odena, extended GANs to the **semi-supervised context** by forcing the discriminator network to **output class labels**.
- It was shown that SGAN improves classification performance on restricted data sets over a baseline classifier with no generative component.

Reference : Semi-Supervised Learning with Generative Adversarial Networks. Augustus Odena. Data Efficient Machine Learning workshop at ICML 2016



MNIST

Objective



Generative Adversarial Learning for Reducing Manual Annotation in Semantic Segmentation on Large Scale Microscopy Images



Automated Vessel Segmentation in Retinal Fundus Image as Test Case

Generative Adversaria Networks



Generative Adversarial Networks

- A game between two players.
 - 1. Generator G
 - 2. Discriminator D
- D tries to discriminate between.
 - A sample from the actual data distribution.
 - And a sample from the generator G.
- G tries to "trick" D by generating samples that are hard for D to distinguish from actual data.

Adversarial nets Framework



Z

Reference - Generative Adversarial Nets. Ian Goodfellow et al. NIPS 2014

Training GANs



$$\min_{G} \max_{D} V(D,G) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}(\boldsymbol{x})} [\log D(\boldsymbol{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{z} \sim p_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{z})} [\log(1 - D(G(\boldsymbol{z})))]$$

Training GANs



Source: https://openai.com/blog/generative-models/

Green distribution starting out random and then the training process iteratively changes the parameters θ to stretch and squeeze it to better match the blue distribution.

DATASET



DRIVE: Digital Retinal Images for Vessel Extraction



- The dataset contains 20 images for training and 20 for testing.
- Blood vessel in each image is manually marked by human observers trained by an experienced ophthalmologist.

Reference: J.J. Staal, M.D. Abramoff, M. Niemeijer, M.A. Viergever, B. van Ginneken, "Ridge-based vessel segmentation in color images of the retina", IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2004 Apr.



• Vascular structures manifest best contrast in green channel.



- Vascular structures manifest best contrast in green channel.
- Contrast Limited Adaptive Histogram Equalization (CLAHE) is used for compensating irregular illuminations.



- Vascular structures manifest best contrast in green channel.
- Contrast Limited Adaptive Histogram Equalization (CLAHE) is used for compensating irregular illuminations.
- **64X64 dimensional patches** were extracted and label of central pixel is assigned as the class label of the entire patch.







Vessel Patches

Ground Truth Binary Image

Igr

Skeletonization I^s gr Vessel Patches from green channel image at pixels where

 $I_{gr}^s = 1$







Background Patches

Ground Truth Binary Image

Igr

Morphological Dilation I^d_{gr} Background Patches from green channel image at pixels where

 $I_{gr}^d = 0$

Network Architecture



• The original version of GAN can be implemented with **2-way softmax** output from discriminator network to find a distribution over [REAL, FAKE].

- The original version of GAN can be implemented with **2-way softmax** output from discriminator network to find a distribution over [REAL, FAKE].
- We incorporate a K+1-way softmax layer at output of discriminator, where now the prediction labels will be [Class 1, Class, 2,.., Class K, FAKE].

- The original version of GAN can be implemented with **2-way softmax** output from discriminator network to find a distribution over [REAL, FAKE].
- We incorporate a K+1-way softmax layer at output of discriminator, where now the prediction labels will be [Class 1, Class, 2,.., Class K, FAKE].
- The revised Discriminator can be termed as a **Discriminator-Classifier** network (DC net).

- The original version of GAN can be implemented with **2-way softmax** output from discriminator network to find a distribution over [REAL, FAKE].
- We incorporate a K+1-way softmax layer at output of discriminator, where now the prediction labels will be [Class 1, Class, 2,.., Class K, FAKE].
- The revised Discriminator can be termed as a **Discriminator-Classifier** network (DC net).
- The DC net now has to minimize two types of losses, viz.
 - a) classification loss (L_c)
 - b) adversarial loss (L_{adv})

Proposed Model of GAN



 G takes in a 300–D standard normal noise vector to create a fake example, G(z) via a series of deconvolution operations.

Proposed Model of GAN



- G takes in a 300-D standard normal noise vector to create a fake example, G(z) via a series of deconvolution operations.
- DC net is to assign correct class label (vessel or background) to real examples coming from stored training database while assigning G(z) to Fake class.

Proposed Model of GAN



- G takes in a 300-D standard normal noise vector to create a fake example, G(z) via a series of deconvolution operations.
- DC net is to assign correct class label (vessel or background) to real examples coming from stored training database while assigning G(z) to Fake class.
- Goal of G is to fool DC in assigning G(z) to any one of the training labels.

Generator Architecture



We apply **instance normalization** after every deconvolution followed by **Rectified linear unit (ReLU)** as non linear activation.

Discriminator/Classifier Architecture



We apply **instance normalization** after every convolution followed by **Leaky Rectified linear unit (LReLU)** as non linear activation.

The DC net is optimized to minimize both classification loss and adversarial loss.

$$L_c = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)\sim p_{data}(x,y)} \log p_{DC}(y|x; y < K+1)$$

$$L_{adv} = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G} \log p_{DC}(y = K + 1|x)$$

The DC net is optimized to minimize both classification loss and adversarial loss.

$$L_c = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p_{data}(x,y)} \log p_{DC}(y|x; y < K+1)$$

$$L_{adv} = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G} \log p_{DC}(y = K + 1|x)$$



• The generator is updated in such a way so that the DC net places minimum probability over class k = K+1.

- The generator is updated in such a way so that the DC net places minimum probability over class k = K+1.
- DC net is therefore **fooled** to believe that the fake example belongs to one of the legitimate K classes of the database. So, for training the generator, we need to maximize, L_G ,

$$L_G = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G} \log p_{DC}(y = K + 1|x)$$

But trying to optimize the generator network with

$$L_G = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G} \log p_{DC}(y = K + 1|x)$$

is practically not advisable because in the early phase of training, **magnitudes of** gradients propagated to generator are small. Thus, we instead minimize,

$$L_G = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G} \log\{1 - p_{DC}(y = K + 1|x)\}$$

Reference - Generative Adversarial Nets. Ian Goodfellow et al. NIPS 2014

Training Details



On each dataset, we train the simple CNN and GAN–CNN from scratch.

ADAM optimizer for both the G and DC net

Slope of leaky ReLU = 0.1

Initial learning rate = 10^{-4} (for both G and DC)

Decay factor of 0.8 after every 20 epochs

Mini-batch size of 64

Testing Details



At **test time**, a real test examples, x_t is assigned a label, $y^*(x)$, according to,

$$y^*(x) = \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} p_{DC}(c = y|x)$$

In retinal vessel segmentation literature, area under the **Receiver Operation Curve**, i.e., **AUC** is taken as a standard metric of comparison. A **larger AUC** signifies a **better segmenter**.

Dataset Size	GAN-CNN	CNN	p-value
150K	0.962	0.960	0.1
30K	0.945	0.921	10 ⁻³
15K	0.931	0.916	10 ⁻⁵

In retinal vessel segmentation literature, area under the **Receiver Operation Curve**, i.e., **AUC** is taken as a standard metric of comparison. A **larger AUC** signifies a **better segmenter**.

Dataset Size	GAN-CNN	CNN	p-value
150K	0.962	0.960	0.1
30K	0.945	0.921	10 ⁻³
15K	0.931	0.916	10 ⁻⁵

Conclusion: p-value (Welch's t-test) indicates that there is significant difference between the mean AUCs of the proposed method and simple CNN, specially when trained on smaller training sets. The null hypothesis in this case is that the mean AUCs of both paradigms of segmenters are same.

ROC curves of proposed GAN-CNN and simple CNN on the combined 20 test images of DRIVE retina dataset.



Curves of GAN-CNN always tends to be higher on the ROC plots compared to simple CNN based segmenter. The visualization bolsters our claim that training a GAN based CNN for semantic segmentation is data efficient.



Samples generated during training on 30K dataset

Samples generated during training on 15K dataset

Real samples

Comparison of mean AUC of some of the contemporary deep learning based retinal vessel segmentation algorithm.

Method	Dataset Size	Mean AUC
Maji et al.	60K	0.928
Lahiri et al.	120K	0.950
Fu et al.	330K	0.947
Liskowski et al.	3857K	0.963
GAN-CNN (Proposed)	30К	0.945
GAN-CNN (Proposed)	15K	0.931

Comparison of mean AUC of some of the contemporary deep learning based retinal vessel segmentation algorithm.

Method	Dataset Size	Mean AUC
Maji et al.	60K	0.928
Lahiri et al.	120K	0.950
Fu et al.	330K	0.947
Liskowski et al.	3857K	0.963
GAN-CNN (Proposed)	30K	0.945
GAN-CNN (Proposed)	15K	0.931

Conclusion. Even with smaller dataset size, our proposed method performs comparable (sometimes even better) than the competing techniques trained with 2X-10X times more training data.



Sample Fundus Image



Ground Truth





CNN trained on 15K

GAN-CNN trained on 15K



CNN trained on 30K



GAN-CNN trained on 30K

• To our best knowledge, this is the **first work** which leverages GAN for semisupervised learning on **large scale fundus imaging** modality for **automated blood vessel segmentation**.

- To our best knowledge, this is the **first work** which leverages GAN for semisupervised learning on **large scale fundus imaging** modality for **automated blood vessel segmentation**.
- We achieve comparable performance (sometimes even better) with recent CNN based segmentation techniques while using upto 9X times less training data.

- To our best knowledge, this is the **first work** which leverages GAN for semisupervised learning on **large scale fundus imaging** modality for **automated blood vessel segmentation**.
- We achieve comparable performance (sometimes even better) with recent CNN based segmentation techniques while using upto 9X times less training data.
- We show that **performance** of simple **CNN based segmenter** starts **deteriorating faster on smaller datasets** compared to GAN-CNN.

- To our best knowledge, this is the **first work** which leverages GAN for semisupervised learning on **large scale fundus imaging** modality for **automated blood vessel segmentation**.
- We achieve comparable performance (sometimes even better) with recent CNN based segmentation techniques while using upto 9X times less training data.
- We show that performance of simple CNN based segmenter starts deteriorating faster on smaller datasets compared to GAN-CNN.
- We show that the **difference of performances** between simple CNN and GAN-CNN is **statistically significant** when trained on **smaller training sets**.

Impact

- We applied the proposed model to the challenging task of vessel segmentation in fundus images, but our concept is generic.
- Fundus Images have.
 - Intricate Branching Pattern
 - Noisy Background
 - Irregular Illumination

Therefore, pixel level manual annotation is much more tedious than image tagging, thus bolstering the importance of our contribution.

Publication

Title: Generative Adversarial Learning for Reducing Manual Annotation in Semantic Segmentation on Large Scale Microscopy Images: Automated Vessel Segmentation in Retinal Fundus Image as Test Case

Conference: Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshop on Computer Vision for Microscopy Image Analysis (CVMI) 2017



Future Work



Future Work

One possibility is to make use of large amount of unlabeled data by forcing the DC-net to place low likelihood for fake class to these examples Another possibility is to use class conditional generator network to force it to generate class specific fake examples and forcing the DC-net to classify these fake examples.

Both of these methods are further steps towards improving the performance of the combined DC–net.

Thank You!