# Research on A Segmentation Quality Evaluation Method of High Score Image Considering Area Difference

Xiaojing Hu<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoping Lu<sup>1</sup>, Shuaifeng Peng<sup>1</sup>, Yingying Su<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Key Laboratory of Spatiotemporal Information and Ecological Restoration of Mines, Natural Resources Department, Henan University of Technology, Jiaozuo, Henan, China

### Abstract

Aiming at the problem that segmentation quality in object - oriented image analysis (OBIA) can improve the accuracy of image information extraction. In this paper, the area difference index is used to evaluate the segmentation results of high score remote sensing images, and the AFI and FCSP evaluation indexes are used to calculate the segmentation quality to verify the reliability of the evaluation indexes in this paper. The research results show that the judgment results of the indicators in this paper are the same as the other two indicators, so the segmentation accuracy evaluation method of high score remote sensing images considering the area difference has certain use value.

## **Keywords**

Area difference index; AFI; FCSP; Object oriented image analysis.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Object oriented segmentation is a kind of image classification technology that is different from taking pixel as a unit, considering the spectral and spatial characteristics of ground objects, and composing homogeneous pixels with small spectral differences into objects of different sizes. Compared with pixel based image classification technology, this method can better consider texture, space, geometric features and other image information besides image spectral information [1], which has certain significance for high-precision classification of remote sensing images.

Object oriented image segmentation is the method and process of searching object regions with the same characteristics, and then obtaining regions of interest [2]. The quality of image segmentation has a significant impact on the accuracy of image classification [3], that is, the high-quality remote sensing image segmentation results are obtained, and the accuracy of remote sensing image information extraction is higher. Therefore, testing and optimizing remote sensing image segmentation algorithms and evaluating the quality of remote sensing images in order to obtain the optimal segmentation results have certain research significance [4]. For this reason, some experts and scholars have made some targeted research. Zhang Hua [5] and others studied the spectral and positional relationship between image reference objects and segmentation objects based on GF-1 images, constructed spectral similarity index and segmentation distance index to evaluate segmentation quality of object oriented segmentation results, and finally obtained the optimal segmentation parameters and improved image classification accuracy. Wang Hongsheng [6] and others constructed the unsupervised evaluation index of global optimal segmentation in order to obtain the optimal segmentation scale. The results show that this method reduces the subjectivity of determining the optimal segmentation scale. Liu Zhaoyi [7] and others improved and realized an automatic calculation model of global optimal scale, realized automatic acquisition of segmentation scale, and reduced the subjectivity of manual participation. Chen Yang [8] and others proposed a segmentation quality evaluation method of shape and position similarity, which can better obtain and determine the best segmentation parameters of images, and provides an effective method to improve the accuracy of image classification. Zhu Chengjie [9] and others proposed a two-way local optimal object matching method to solve the reference object matching problem in the supervision and evaluation method, which can better evaluate the segmentation results.

In recent years, with the emergence and application of domestic high resolution satellite, the research on the application of domestic high resolution remote sensing image in various fields has gradually risen. Compared with medium and low resolution remote sensing satellite images, high-resolution satellite images have more abundant texture and structure information [10]. When extracting information from high resolution remote sensing images, pixel based image information extraction technology is difficult to consider the image's strong texture features and geometric features. Therefore, it is of great significance to use object-oriented segmentation technology that can comprehensively utilize image information for information extraction of high-resolution remote sensing images. Zheng Lan [11] and others used the object-oriented classification method to classify the SPOT-5 image of Pingtan Island, Fujian, and achieved good results. Mao Zhaowu [12] and others used GeoEye-1 high resolution image to perform object-oriented segmentation and evaluate the segmentation quality, and obtained the best segmentation result, providing favorable help for later classification.

Based on previous studies, this paper proposes a segmentation quality evaluation method that takes into account the area difference, builds the linear relationship between the reference object and the segmentation object, evaluates the quality of the segmentation results, and provides an effective method to obtain the optimal segmentation parameters and further improve the accuracy of information extraction, aiming at the beneficial role of object-oriented segmentation results in improving the classification information extraction of remote sensing images.

### 2. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

### 2.1. Area Difference Index

Use the high-resolution remote sensing image to obtain the boundary information of the object as the reference object for segmentation object comparison, set segmentation parameters to segment the experimental image to obtain the segmentation object of the object, analyze the difference between the segmentation object and the reference object, and evaluate the image segmentation quality according to the difference degree [13]. The smaller the difference between the reference object and the segmented object, the better the segmentation result and the higher the accuracy. Assuming that the reference object is P and the segmentation object is M, the segmentation quality evaluation index based on the difference of the intersection area between the reference object and the segmentation object is constructed according to the theoretical information:

$$MA = \frac{P_{area} \cap (\sum_{i=1}^{n} M_i)_{area}}{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} M_i)_{area}}, MA\epsilon(0,1]$$

In the above formula, MA represents the area difference index (Intersect Maximum Area),  $P_{area}$  Represents the area of the reference object,  $(\sum_{i=1}^{n} M_i)_{area}$  Represents the merged area of split objects whose centroid location is within the range of the reference object.

### 2.2. AFI Evaluation Index

AFI index is proposed by foreign scholar Lucieer et al. [14] to select the segmentation object that intersects with the reference object and has the largest area among the segmentation

objects participating in segmentation quality evaluation, and to construct a quantitative relationship compared with the reference object. The indicator expression is shown in the formula:

$$AFI = \frac{A_{ref_{object}} - A_{Max_{segment}}}{A_{ref_{object}}}, AFI\epsilon(-1,1)$$

In the above AFI  $A_{ref_{object}}$  Represents the area of the reference object,  $A_{Max_{segment}}$  Represents the area of the divided object. When the AFI index is close to 0, it means that the area difference between the selected segmentation object and the reference object is small, and the segmentation result is optimal. When there are objects intersected in the inverse ratio between the area of the reference object and the area of the object, the AFI index is the smallest, but the segmentation result is not optimal. Therefore, the index has some limitations in practical application.

#### 2.3. FCSP Evaluation Index

FCSP (Figure of Correct Segmentation Percentage) is the percentage of correct segmentation. It refers to the segmentation quality evaluation index obtained by dividing a segmentation map into n pieces by area i, searching for the objects with the maximum correct segmentation area contained in the region, and then successively stacking and dividing by the total area of the segmentation map. Assume that the object of the maximum correct partition area in different area i is  $S_i'$ , and the partition area is  $S_i$ . Then the FCSP can be expressed as:

$$FCSP = \frac{\sum_{i}^{N} S_{i}'}{\sum_{i}^{N} S_{i}}, FCSP\epsilon(0,1]$$

This index is a segmentation quality evaluation index constructed by Chen Qiuxiao et al. [15] based on simple statistical calculation method after selecting the maximum correct segmentation object for the middle area of the segmentation map and cumulatively stacking and comparing the area of the segmentation map. The larger the index value, the better the segmentation quality.

# 3. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

### 3.1. Study Area and Data

The data used in this paper is the GF-1PMS remote sensing image data located in Linzhou area, Anyang City, Henan Province. According to the research content, the densely distributed urban buildings in Linzhou City are randomly sampled to obtain the distribution map of housing buildings with research value for this study. As shown in Figure 1. The image includes blue, green and red bands, with a resolution of 1 meter. The main distributed objects in the image are houses, roads and green spaces.



Figure 1. Study area

### 3.2. Image Segmentation

The image segmentation technology used in this paper is a rule-based object-oriented segmentation method provided by ENVI software, which includes three parameters: scale level, merge level, and texture kernel size. During image segmentation, the optimal segmentation parameters are obtained by repeatedly experimenting with parameter permutation and combination [16]. After many experiments, it is verified that the change of the merging threshold and the texture kernel threshold has little impact on the segmentation results. Therefore, the parameter combination used in this paper mainly sets the segmentation threshold, including 20, 30, 40, 50, 60. The merging threshold and the texture kernel are 90 and 3 respectively. The parameter settings are shown in Table 1. The reference object used in the experiment is obtained through visual interpretation as shown in Figure 2.

Scale	Merge	Txture Kernal
20	90	3
30	90	3
40	90	3
50	90	3
60	90	3



Figure 2. Vector boundary of reference object

### **3.3. Segmentation Results of Different Parameter Combinations**

Randomly number each reference image, and select multiple merged segmentation objects corresponding to the reference object as validation samples. Combining the combination of parameter threshold setting and object-oriented segmentation algorithm, the experimental image used in this study is segmented object-oriented, and then the quality of segmentation results of different parameter combinations under the same image is analyzed based on the segmentation quality evaluation method proposed in this paper to estimate the area difference index. The results of each parameter segmentation are shown in Figure 3.

ISSN: 2472-3703



Figure 3. Visual diagram of segmentation results of each parameter

In the figure, green represents the vector boundary of the reference object, and each filling surface represents the merging results of the randomly selected segmentation objects under different segmentation parameters. According to the segmentation results of each parameter, it can be seen that: under different segmentation parameters, each segmentation result basically tends to the reference image boundary; The coincidence degree between the segmentation results with different parameters and the reference object is small. Therefore, in order to better analyze the quality of segmentation results under different parameters, this paper constructs a segmentation quality evaluation index that takes into account the area difference, evaluates the quality of segmentation results. The comparison table of index evaluation results is shown in Table 2.

ISSN: 2472-3703

DOI: 10.6911/WSRJ.202211\_8(11).0016

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Serial No	Scale	Merge	Txture Kernal	MA
30     90     3     0.962       50     90     3     0.951       60     90     3     0.203       60     90     3     0.203       60     90     3     0.817       6     30     90     3     0.817       6     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       13     40     90     3     0.969       14     40     90     3     0.975       60     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       15 <td></td> <td>20</td> <td>90</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.918</td>		20	90	3	0.918
3     40     90     3     0.951       60     90     3     0.201       60     90     3     0.203       70     90     3     0.817       6     40     90     3     0.817       6     40     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       13     40     90     3     0.912       14     40     90     3     0.972       13     30     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       15     90     3     0.973 <td></td> <td>30</td> <td>90</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.962</td>		30	90	3	0.962
50     90     3     0.208       60     90     3     0.208       20     90     3     0.817       6     40     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       13     40     90     3     0.817       13     40     90     3     0.485       50     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.937       15	3	40	90	3	0.962
		50	90	3	0.951
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	0.208
6     40     90     3     0.817       50     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.912       8     40     90     3     0.912       6     90     3     0.912       8     40     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       13     40     90     3     0.912       14     90     90     3     0.485       50     90     3     0.485       60     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       15     50     90     3     0.973       16     90     3		20	90	3	0.817
6     40     90     3     0.817       50     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.912       30     90     3     0.912       8     40     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.912       60     90     3     0.817       50     90     3     0.817       60     90     3     0.485       60     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.972       14     40     90     3     0.937 <tr< td=""><td></td><td>30</td><td>90</td><td>3</td><td>0.817</td></tr<>		30	90	3	0.817
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6	40	90	3	0.817
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.817
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	1.297
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.912
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30	90	3	0.912
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	8	40	90	3	0.912
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.912
20     90     3     0.817       30     90     3     0.969       13     40     90     3     0.485       50     90     3     0.485       60     90     3     0.975       20     90     3     0.972       30     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.972       60     90     3     0.937       16     40     90     3     0.937       16     40     90     3     0.923       50     90     3 <td></td> <td>60</td> <td>90</td> <td>3</td> <td>1.476</td>		60	90	3	1.476
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.817
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30	90	3	0.969
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	13	40	90	3	0.485
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.485
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	0.975
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.972
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30	90	3	0.972
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	14	40	90	3	0.972
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.972
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	0.978
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.887
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30	90	3	0.919
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	15	40	90	3	0.866
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.866
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	0.937
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.026
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16	30	90	3	0.849
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		40	90	3	0.953
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.905
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	1.002
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	17	20	90	3	0.923
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30 40	90	э 2	0.923
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		40	90	3	0.923
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.090
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19	20	90	2	0.004
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	90	3	0.917
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		40	90	3	0.812
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	90	3	0.874
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60	90	3	0.837
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	22	20	90	<u> </u>	0.023
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30	90	3	0.894
50   90   3   0.863   0.863   0.962		40	90	3	0.894
		50	90	3	0.863
UU 7U 3 U.00.3		60	90	3	0.863

Table 2. Comparison of Index Evaluation Results
---

According to the calculation results of area difference indicators under different parameters corresponding to each sample, it can be seen that:. (2) According to the change trend of parameter combination under each segmented sample, when the segmentation threshold is 60, the proportion of samples is 60%. Therefore, according to the segmentation quality evaluation index constructed in this paper, when the parameter combination is 60, 90, and 3, better segmentation results can be obtained.

#### 3.4. Evaluation of Different Indicators Based on Segmentation Results

In order to verify the reliability of the segmentation quality evaluation index constructed in this paper, AFI and FCSP are selected to evaluate the experimental image segmentation results under different parameter combinations, and the optimal segmentation parameter selection results of different indexes are obtained and compared. Table 3 shows the results of calculating the mean values of different indicators of the segmented objects under the corresponding numbers of the reference objects.

Table 3. Calculation Results of Different Parameter Indexes					
Scale	MA	AFI	FCSP		
20	0.661	0.501	0.430		
30	0.877	0.489	0.462		
40	0.889	0.489	0.465		
50	0.871	0.471	0.488		
60	1.033	0.446	0.522		

According to the average value of different indicators of the segmentation object, combined with the evaluation theory of each indicator, it can be seen that: (1) The larger the MA is, the closer it is to 1; The smaller the AFI value is; The higher the FCSP value, the better the segmentation quality. (2) The optimal segmentation parameters selected for AFI and FCSP indicators are consistent with the results of the selection of indicators considering area differences constructed in this paper, that is, when Scale=60, Merge=90, and Txture Kernel=3, the segmentation quality is the best.

### 4. CONCLUSION

The segmentation quality evaluation index constructed in this paper considers the intersection area difference between the reference object and the segmentation object. By randomly selecting the segmentation object and calculating the evaluation value of the index under different parameters, the parameter combination: 60, 90, 3 are the best segmentation parameter combination. At the same time, AFI and FCSP indicators are selected to verify the reliability of the index in this paper. The results show that the optimal combination of segmentation parameters selected by the three indicators is consistent, that is, when the parameter combination is Scale=60, Merge=90, and Txture Kernel=3, the segmentation quality is the best. Therefore, this index provides a reliable index for high score image segmentation to obtain the optimal segmentation parameters.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Zhuang Xiyang, Zhao Shuhe, Chen Cheng, Cong Dianmin, Qu Yongchao. Supervision and evaluation of object-oriented optimal segmentation scale of remote sensing images [J]. Remote Sensing of Land and Resources, 2016, 28 (04): 49-58.
- [2] Castleman K R. Digital image processing[M]. Prentice Hall Press, 1996.
- [3] Cheng J, Bo Y, Zhu Y, et al. A novel method for assessing the segmentation quality of high-spatial resolution remote-sensing images[J]. International Journal of Remote Sensing, 2014, 35(10): 3816-3839.
- [4] Ming Dongping, Luo Jiancheng, Zhou Chenghu, Wang Jing. Feature segmentation and algorithm evaluation analysis of high-resolution remote sensing images [J]. Earth Information Science, 2006 (01): 103-109.

- [5] Zhang Hua, Zhang Gaigai. Object oriented multiscale segmentation of GF-1 remote sensing image [J]. Journal of Gansu Agricultural University, 2018,53 (04): 116-123.
- [6] Wang Hongsheng, Li Yongshu, Wu Xi, Li Zheng. Object oriented UAV image land use classification combined with spatial analysis [J]. Surveying and Mapping Engineering, 2018,27 (02): 57-61. DOI: 10.19349/j.cnki.issn1006-7949.2018.02.011
- [7] Liu Zhaoyi, Li Xinhui, Shen Runping, Zhu Feng, Zhang Kai, Wang Tian, Wang Yuanyuan. Optimal Scale Selection for High Resolution Remote Sensing Image Segmentation [J]. Computer Engineering and Application, 2014,50 (06): 144-147.
- [8] Chen Yang, Fan Rongshuang, Wang Jingxue, Li Wei. Image segmentation quality evaluation method with similar shape and position [J]. Surveying and Mapping Science, 2018, 43 (09): 98-102+128. DOI: 10.16251/j.cnki.1009-2307.2018.09.018
- [9] Zhu Chengjie, Yang Shizhi, Cui Geng, Cheng Wei, Cheng Chen. Object oriented method for evaluating the segmentation accuracy of high-resolution remote sensing images [J]. Intense Laser and Particle Beam, 2015, 27 (06): 43-49.
- [10] Mao Zhaowu, Cheng Jiehai, Yuan Zhanliang. An evaluation method for segmentation quality of high resolution remote sensing image objects [J]. Surveying and Mapping Bulletin, 2016 (05): 36-40. DOI: 10.13474/j.cnki.11-2246.2016.0150.
- [11] Zheng Lan, Huang Wanli. Multi scale segmentation parameter optimization of high-resolution remote sensing images and its application in object-oriented classification [J]. Journal of Subtropical Resources and Environment, 2015,10 (04): 77-85.
- [12] Mao Zhaowu, Cheng Jiehai, Yuan Zhanliang. High resolution remote sensing image segmentation quality evaluation method considering area and location differences [J]. Remote Sensing Technology and Application, 2016,31 (01): 186-193.
- [13] Zhang Jun, Zhu Guolong, Li Yan. Research on scale effect and optimal scale in object-oriented highresolution image information extraction [J]. Surveying and Mapping Science, 2011, 36 (02): 107-109+58. DOI: 10.16251/j.cnki.1009-2307.2011.02.019
- [14] A. Lucieer and A. Stein, "Existential uncertainty of spatial objects segmented from satellite sensor imagery," in IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, vol. 40, no. 11, pp. 2518-2521, Nov. 2002, doi: 10.1109/TGRS.2002.805072.
- [15] Möller M, Lymburner L, Volk M. The comparison index: A tool for assessing the accuracy of image segmentation[J]. International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 2007, 9(3): 311-321.
- [16] Mao Zhaowu Research on segmentation quality evaluation method of high spatial resolution remote sensing image [D]. Henan University of Technology, 2016.