A Comparison of Image Segmentation Using LOT, ROR, and Enhanced ROR

Dr. B. Suresh Kumar Associate Professor, Department of Computer Science AJK College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore-641105.

ABSTRACT:

The image segmentation is used to change or simplify the image representation for the purpose of easy understanding or quicker analysis. Image segmentation is a process of segmenting an image into groups of pixels based on some criterions. Image segmentation is the process of partitioning a digital image into multiple segments. The purpose of image segmentation is to partition an image into meaningful regions with respect to particular application. The image segmentation is used for various applications such as medical images, Satellite images, content based image retrieval, machine vision, Recognition Tasks and Video Surveillance. There are so many methods used for segmentations such as compression based methods, thresholding, and clustering. The clustering methods can be divided into two parts namely supervised and unsupervised. Supervised clustering involves predefining the cluster size for segmenting whereas unsupervised segmentation segments by its own cluster values. The spine segmentation is used to get validate cluster extraction and vertibri output. Comparing the three methods the accuracy level is differ from other methods. The advantages of each method are the speed of time is achieved.

Keywords:

Fuzzy C-Means (FCM), K-Means, Adaptive Kmeans, Adaptive Fuzzy-k-means (AFKM), Supervised, Unsupervised, Vertebral, Robust OutlyingnessRatio (ROR).

I. INTRODUCTION

Image segmentation is the process of partitioning a digital image into multiple segments. The image segmentation is often meted out in two days that

The specially supervised and unsupervised. supervised clustering involves predefining the cluster size for segmenting the images [1, 2]. The unsupervised segmentation segments by its own cluster values. The vertebral column is also known as the backbone orspine. The spine is formed from individual bones called vertebrae. The distinguishes unsupervised learning from supervised learning and reinforcement learning clustering algorithms have successfully been applied as a digital image segmentation technique in various fields and applications. The spine segmentation is used to convert cluster to binary and separated by valid cluster [10,11,12].

The advantages of clustering base methods are,

- a. Clustering define relation of the pixel which can be used for many applications.
- b. User can define the segmentation number.
- c. More flexible to extract particular gray values.

The unsupervised learning also encompasses many other techniques that seek to summarize and explain key feature of the data. The unsupervised learning is based on data mining methods used to preprocess data.

II. RELATED WORKS

Fuzzy c-means of supervised learning of clustering techniques used on established outstanding results in semi-automated segmenting medical images in a robust manner. The k-means algorithm heavily relies on the initial centroids. The adaptive k-means clustering algorithm is capable of segmenting the regions of smoothly varying intensity distributions. The Adaptive Fuzzy –k means (AFKM) clustering is used for image segmentation which could be applied on general images, specialimages [4, 7, 8, and 9].

III. METHOODOLOGY

Supervised Learning LOT : I

The preprocessing includes the input image is getting for high frequency noise removal and removal of blurring effect [3, 5, 16], then the user can define the value which depends on accuracy user needed for segmentation.

ROR Processing

MED = MEDIAN(Y)

MAD = MEDIAN (|Y-MED|)

MADN = MAD/0.6457

ROR= |Y-MED/MADN|

ROR TREE



SYSTEM OVERVIEW: I



Unsupervised Learning: II

The pre-processing includes cropping the image, resizing the image and sharpening the image. Cropping involves selecting the required area needed in the retina image and cropping it. Resizing image is based on the cropped area the image is resized to fit to that cropped area. The Sharpening image cropped is adjusted for its contrast and brightness to enhance its appearance and to visualize the layers more perfectly [6, 17].



Methodology Diagram



IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The table below shows that the comparison results of different methods of segmentation such as supervised learning, unsupervised learning and spine Segmentation of the accuracy.



Original Image



Supervised LOT Image



C) Unsupervised ROR Image



d) Unsupervised Enhanced ROR Image

LOT Accuracy



ROR Accuracy



Enhanced ROR Accuracy





Graph shows that comparing three methods of Accuracy

V. CONCLUSION

The three proposed work has been presented and a comparison of image segmentation using LOT, ROR, and enhanced ROR. The proposed method of supervised learning for segmentation with the user dependency to get semi automated generated of the segmented output images. The other two methods of unsupervised learning and spine segmentation without the user dependency to get automatically generated of the segmented output images. Compare to the other methods the spine segmentation output of the accuracy was better than the supervised and unsupervised segmentation. The accuracy is achieved for four different types of images.

REFERENCES

[1]F.Aguera,F.J.Aguilar, and M.A.Aguilar,"using texture analysis to improve per-pixel classification of very high resolution images for mapping plastic greenhouse" in the journal of ISPRS J.Photogramm. Remote sense, Vol.63,No.6, PP.635-646, Nov.2008.

[2] U.C.Benz,P.Hofmann,G.willhauck,I.Lingenfelder ,and M.Heynen,"Multiresolution,object-oriented fuzzy analysis of remote sensing data for GIS ready information", in the journal of ISPRS J.Photogramm Remote Sense, Vol. 58, No.3/4, PP 239-258, Jan 2004.

[3] A.M.Fahim, A.M.Salem, F.A.Torkey and A. Ramadan, "An efficient enhanced K-means clustering algorithm", in the Journal of Zhejiang University, Vol.10, No.7, PP.1626-1633, 2006.

[4] K.A.AbdulNasser and M.P.Sebastian, "Improving the accuracy and efficiency of the K-means clustering algorithm" in International conference on Data mining and knowledge Engineering (ICDMKE), Proceedings of the word congress on Engineering (WCE-2009), Vol.1,July 2009,London,UK. and know-ledge Engineering(ICDMKE),Proceedings of the word congress on Engineering (WCE-2009), Vol.1, July 2009, London, UK. Koheri Arai and Ali RidhoBerrakhab, "Hierarchical K-means: an algorithm for centroids initialization for Kmeans", Department of information science and Electrical.

[5] Akansha Mehrotra ,Krishna Kant Singh, M. J. Nigam"ANovel Algorithm for Impulse Noise Removal and Edge Detection", international journal of computer applications (0975-8887), Vol. 38, No.7, january2012.

[6] Jordan, Michael I.; Bishop, Christopher M.
(2004). "Neural Networks".In Allen B. Tucker.
Computer Science Handbook, Second Edition
(Section VII: Intelligent Systems). Boca Raton, FL:
Chapman & Hall/CRC Press LLC. ISBN 1-58488360-X.

[7] Chuang Keh-Shih, Hong-Long Tzeng, Sharon Chen, Jay Wu, Tzong-Jer Chen. (2006). "Fuzzy c - meansclustering with spatial information for image segmentation". Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics .309 - 15.

[8]T.S. Huang. "A knowledge-based approach to volumetric medical image segmentation", Proceedings of 1st International Conference on Image Processing ICIP-94, 1994.

[9]Chen, C, W, Lou, Parker, K.J (1998), "Image Segmentation via Adaptive K-means Clustering and Knowledge-based Morphological Operation with Biomedical Applications" IEEE Transactions on Image Processing.

[10] Klinder T, Ostermann J, Ehm M, Franz A, Kneser R, Lorenz C. Automated model-based vertebra detection, identification, and segmentation in CT images. MedImage Anal 2009; 13:471–82.

[11] Stern D, Likar B, Pernus F, Vrtovec T. Parametric modelling and segmen-tation of vertebral bodies in 3D CT and MR spine images. Phys Med Biol2011; 56(23):7505–22. [12] Ma J, Lu L. Hierarchical segmentation and identification of thoracic vertebra using learning-based edge detection and coarse-to-fine deformable model.Comput Vis Image Underst 2013;117(9):1072–83.

[13] W. X. Kang, Q. Q. Yang, R. R. Liang, "The Comparative Research on Image Segmentation Algorithms", IEEE Conference on ETCS, pp. 703-707, 2009.[14]K.K. Singh, A. Singh, "A Study of Image Segmentation Algorithms for Different Types of Images", International Journal of Computer Science Issues, Vol. 7, Issue 5, 2010.

[15] P.Lukac, R. Hudec, M. Benco, P. Kamencay, Z. Dubcova, M. Zachariasova, "Simple Comparison of Image Segmentation Algorithms Based on Evaluation Criterion", IEEE Conference on Radio elektronika, pp. 1-4, 2011.

[16]B.Sureshkumar,B.L.Shivakumar, "Supervised Image segmentation using LOT",ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences ,Vol.9,No.10,PP.1946-1951,Oct.2014.

[17] B.Sureshkumar,B.L.Shivakumar, "Unsupervised Image segmentation using ROR",International Journal of Advanced Research in computer science (IJARCS),Vol.5,No.7,PP.217-221,Oct.2014.

[18]B. Sureshkumar, B. L. Shivakumar, "Spine Segmentation in Medical Image Processing using Unsupervised learning", International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE), Vol.4,No.7,PP.47-50,Dec.2014.

| SUPERVISED SEGMENTATION - LOT METHOD | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---------------|------|--------|-------|-----|-------------|-------------|----------|--|--|
| S.no | Image | Size of Image | ТР | TN | FP | FN | Sensitivity | Specificity | Accuracy | | |
| 1 | Image1 | 512 | 4015 | 248432 | 7712 | 243 | 0.942931 | 0.969892 | 96.94511 | | |
| 2 | Image2 | 512 | 4824 | 248564 | 7673 | 239 | 0.9527948 | 0.970055 | 96.97206 | | |
| 3 | Image3 | 512 | 5285 | 247787 | 8357 | 236 | 0.9572541 | 0.967374 | 96.71603 | | |
| 4 | Image4 | 512 | 4835 | 240767 | 15470 | 312 | 0.9393822 | 0.939626 | 93.9621 | | |
| | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| UNSUPERVISED SEGMENTATION - ROR METHOD | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S.no | Image | Size of Image | ТР | TN | FP | FN | Sensitivity | Specificity | Accuracy | | |
| 1 | Image1 | 512 | 4134 | 249532 | 6612 | 124 | 0.9708783 | 0.974186395 | 97.41323 | | |
| 2 | Image2 | 512 | 4975 | 248564 | 7673 | 88 | 0.982619 | 0.970055066 | 97.02985 | | |
| 3 | Image3 | 512 | 5381 | 247987 | 8157 | 140 | 0.9746423 | 0.968154632 | 96.82915 | | |
| 4 | Image4 | 512 | 4963 | 241237 | 15000 | 184 | 0.964251 | 0.941460445 | 94.19092 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | - | | |

SPINE SEGMENTATION - ENHANCED ROR METHOD Size of Image ТР FP S.no Image TN FN Sensitivity Specificity Accuracy 512 254523 1621 0.993671529 99.3775 1 Image1 4258 0 1 2 512 5063 253227 3010 0 1 0.988253063 98.84807 Image2 3 1314 0 0.994870073 Image3 512 5521 254830 1 99.49783 4 Image4 512 5147 254888 1349 0 1 0.994735343 99.4839

| S.no | Image | Enhanced ROR Accuracy | ROR Accuracy | LOT Accuracy |
|------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Image1 | 98.37750094 | 97.41323031 | 96.94510795 |
| 2 | Image2 | 97.84806736 | 97.02985075 | 96.97206276 |
| 3 | Image3 | 98.4978312 | 96.82915178 | 96.71603004 |
| 4 | Image4 | 98.48390108 | 94.19092217 | 93.96213999 |

Table shows that comparing three methods of Accuracy