Unsupervised Object Region Proposals for RGB-D Indoor Scenes

Zhuo Deng^a, Sinisa Todorovic^b, Longin Jan Latecki^a

^a1925 N. 12th St, CIS Department, Temple University, Philadelphia, USA

^b2107 Kelley Engineering Center, School of EECS, Oregon State University, Corvallis, USA

Abstract

In this paper, we present a novel unsupervised framework for automatically generating bottom up class independent object candidates for detection and recognition in cluttered indoor environments. Utilizing raw depth map from active sensors such as Kinect, we propose a novel plane segmentation algorithm for dividing an indoor scene into predominant planar regions and non-planar regions. Based on this partition, we are able to effectively predict object locations and their spatial extensions. Our approach automatically generates object proposals considering five different aspects: Non-planar Regions (NPR), Planar Regions (PR), Detected Planes (DP), Merged Detected Planes (MDP) and Hierarchical Clustering (HC) of 3D point clouds. Object region proposals include both bounding boxes and instance segments. Our approach achieves very competitive results and is even able to outperform supervised state-of-the-art algorithms on the challenging NYU-v2 RGB-Depth dataset. In addition, we apply our approach to the most recently released large scale RGB-Depth dataset from Princeton University – "SUN RGBD", which utilizes four different depth sensors. Its consistent performance demonstrates a general applicability of our approach.

Keywords: Object segmentation, RGB-D, Sensor fusion.

1. Introduction

Automatically generating high quality class independent object segmentations is important for many high level computer vision problems such as object

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

May 16, 2016

detection and recognition. For object recognition, since feature extraction relies
 5 directly on the information of its supporting region, the full object region not
 only conveys global features but also arguably enriches contextual features as
 confusing background is separated [1]. For object detection, an object can be
 located at any position and scale in the image. Most of existing work [2, 3]
 is based on sliding window strategy where exhaustive searching is conducted
 10 at various scales and window aspect ratios. However, expensive computation
 prevents this strategy from utilizing sophisticated feature representations. As
 an alternative, providing a small set of high quality location hypotheses makes
 it possible to adopt richer features and complex learning algorithms [1, 4, 5].

Many previous works are dedicated to propose class independent object hy-
 15 potheses. Uijlings *et al.* [6] proposed a selective search strategy that hierarchi-
 cally groups similar neighbor superpixels obtained from [7] for predicting object
 locations. In contrast, besides predicting object bounding boxes, we also aim at
 providing pixel-level object segments. Carreira *et al.* [8] generated a set of object
 segments by solving one constrained parametric min-cut (CPMC) problem for
 20 each configuration of predefined foreground and background seeds. Lin *et al.* [9]
 simply extends CPMC by integrating depth for computing potentials. Instead of
 treating all image region uniformly, we tactically generate hypotheses according
 to classified regions. Gupta *et al.* [10] generalized gPb-UCM hierarchical segmen-
 tation [11] by making effective use of depth information. Arbelaez *et al.* [12]
 25 proposed Multiscale Combinatorial Grouping (MCG) to collect segments from
 multiscale aligned gPb-UCM segmentations. Gupta *et al.* [13] extend MCG to
 utilize depth cues for region proposals. While [10, 12, 13] need to learn contour
 models or/and Pareto front for combinatorial purpose, our approach proposes
 object regions in an unsupervised way.

30 We have designed and implemented an integrated system for automatically
 proposing both object bounding boxes and pixel-level segments in RGB-D im-
 ages. All the object candidates are generated without any training stage. The
 overall architecture is presented in the diagram shown in Figure 1. The source
 code of this work will be available online.

Figure 1: The diagram of the proposed system for generating object regions in indoor scenes. Taking one color image and corresponding registered raw depth map from Kinect sensors as inputs, our approach automatically generates object proposals considering five different aspects: Non-planar Regions (NPR), Planar Regions (PR), Detected Planes (DP), Merged Detected Planes (MDP) and Hierarchical Clustering (HC) of 3D point clouds. Object region proposals include both bounding boxes and instance segments. The bottom row shows several examples of generated instances and bounding boxes (green color).

35 We first estimate a general scene layout by fitting planes to 3D points recovered from depth maps. Hence we utilize a common strategy of distinguishing clutter regions from planar regions. In contrast to earlier works like Hedau *et al.* [14], we do not make any assumptions that edges representing joints of walls/floor/ceiling are visible. Such assumptions were necessary when only RGB

40 data is given. Since we also utilize depth data, the planar surface may represent different objects like table top or other furniture tops. Then we classify planar regions into boundary and non-boundary planes, where a boundary plane is a plane with no objects behind it, e.g., walls and floors. Depending on the scene a table top can also be a boundary plane. Crude bounding box (BB) object

45 proposals are obtained by fitting BBs to planar regions and to segments obtained from Multi-Channel Multi-Scale (MCMS) segmentations and 3D point cloud clustering with the guidance of the estimated scene layout. Finally, we utilize GrabCut [15] to generate segment proposals and refined BB proposals. GrabCut is an excellent foreground object segmenter that is able to dynamically

50 model global object and background properties. However, it has two major

limitations. It was developed as (1) interactive human in the loop approach, and it is based on the assumption that (2) the input image contains only one salient object and its background. We address both limitations in the proposed framework and turn GrabCut into a fully automatic, unsupervised segmenter.

55 A general outline of the proposed approach is as follows:

1. Estimate scene layout (Section 2.2)
 - (a) fitting planes to reconstructed 3D points
 - (b) classify planar regions into boundary and non-boundary planes
2. Generate crude BB object proposals (Section 2.3)
 - 60 (a) Multi-Channel Multi-Scale (MCMS) segmentations
 - (b) Euclidean point cloud clustering
 - (c) five strategies to generate crude BB proposals
3. Use extended GrabCut to generate segment proposals and refined BB proposals (Section 2.1)

65 We evaluate the proposed approach on standard NYU-v2 RGBD dataset [16] and recent released large scale SUN RGBD dataset [17] in Section 3.

To summarize, the main contributions of our approach are: 1) A novel scene structure guided framework for generating bottom-up object region candidates in cluttered indoor scenes. The framework is completely unsupervised, so there
70 is no need to access ground truth information for region proposals, and no bias resulting from the selection of training data. 2) The number of proposed object regions is much less than the state-of-the-arts while the performance is comparable. Hence the proposed framework has a great potential for high-level computer vision tasks such as object detection and recognition. 3) A novel 3D
75 plane segmentation algorithm that is able to detect and segment predominant planar structures of indoor scenes. It is demonstrated to be robust to noise in structured light and other depth sensors.

2. Object region proposals in RGBD images

2.1. GrabCut Extension

80 In this section we describe our extension of GrabCut that generates final object segments and BB proposals. The input are initial crude BBs generated by component two.

GrabCut [15] is an iterative GraphCut [18] based segmentation algorithm. Given a region of interest (ROI) in an image, pixels inside ROI are initially labeled as "unknown" and outside are labeled as "background". The goal of GrabCut is to identify the object pixels within this "unknown" region. In general, two Gaussian Mixture Models (GMMs) of K components ($K = 5$ typically) are used to model foreground and background color distributions, respectively. Model parameters π, μ, Σ are weights, mean and covariance matrices of the $2K$ Gaussian components:

$$\underline{\theta} = \{\pi(\alpha, k), \mu(\alpha, k), \Sigma(\alpha, k), \alpha = 0, 1, k = 1 \dots K\}, \quad (1)$$

where α represents the foreground or background. A Gibbs energy function E is defined on the graph G in Eq. (2), where each pixel is taken as a node.

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^n D(p_i, \alpha, \underline{\theta}) + \sum_{(u,v) \in C} \gamma * [\alpha_u \neq \alpha_v] * \exp(-\beta \|p_u - p_v\|^2) \quad (2)$$

The data term D encodes the probability of pixel p_i belonging to foreground or background. It is defined as GMM of K components. The smoothness
85 term encourages regional coherence when pixels have similar properties. γ is a constant for balancing data term and smoothness term. C represents the set of pairs of adjacent pixels (we use 4-connectivity), and the constant β is set as inverse of expectation of pixel differences over C defined in Eq. (3). At each iteration, the optimal label assignment is obtained by minimizing energy
90 E using GraphCut. Then GMMs parameters in Eq. (1) are updated according to the label assignment.

$$\beta = \frac{\sum_{(u,v) \in C} 1}{2 \sum_{(u,v) \in C} (\sqrt{\|p_u - p_v\|^2})} \quad (3)$$

Figure 2: Image samples comparison. The first three images are from GrabCut dataset. The last one from NYU-V2 dataset presents a typical cluttered indoor scene.

GrabCut is an interactive segmentation algorithm in that it needs human to provide some hint such as a bounding box around the object candidate. Moreover, it is designed for images consisting of one single salient object with
 95 nearly uniform background, e.g., see Figure 2.

We observe that when GrabCut is initialized with BBs around object proposals both requirements are met. Our initial guess for object locations is obtained as crude image segments described in Section 2.3. Therefore, we initialize it with BBs around crude segments. In order to increase the chance to cover the
 100 whole object by the BB region, we in practice slightly enlarge the BB region. The initial foreground object model is then estimated on the BB region while the initial background model is estimated on the remaining part of the image. It is worth noting that while the whole image is needed for foreground and background model estimations, the object segments are only based on local solution
 105 to Eq. (2), i.e., the nodes of graph G are pixels within this region. By solving Eq. (2) locally for each proposal BB we convert GrabCut into a fully automatic, multiple object segmenter.

Although original GrabCut algorithm shows good performance on foreground segmentation, it often fails to segment objects which have similar color distributions as background, or sometimes decomposes objects into several separated
 110 components in image plane. For example, in Figure 3, the foreground derived from GrabCut consists of several disconnected pieces and some parts that should belong to the toilet instance are missing.

In order to avoid assigning different labels to pixels that are spatially close,
 115 we extend GrabCut by utilizing depth information. We first fill missing data in

Figure 3: Examples for foreground segmentation comparison between GrabCut (GC) and its 3D extension (GC3D) both initialized with BBs in yellow frames.

raw depth map using colorization scheme of [19] and extract 3D points (x, y, z) . Then 3D point coordinates (in cm unit) are simply concatenated with RGB channels at each pixel. Hence we consider 6 dimensional GMMs.

Although on average the extended GC3D outperforms the original one due to utilization of depth data, e.g., as is shown in Figure 3, the toilet instance has been segmented well even if it has similar color distribution to the background, the performance of GC3D may degrade when noise in depth is present. One example is shown in the right scene of Figure 3, where a small piece of background is mis-classified. In this case the original GrabCut works well, since the color of the foreground object differs significantly from the background. Therefore, we output the segments from both GrabCut and GC3D as our final segment candidates.

2.2. Scene Layout Estimation

Structured indoor environments are often filled with man-made structures and objects, which can be approximately represented with planar segments. We first focus on extracting predominant planar regions such as wall, floor, blackboard, cabinet etc from dense point clouds derived from the depth image, not only because planar regions themselves are meaningful but also they are helpful for generating object hypotheses by focusing on point cloud not explained by major planes. As is well known, comparing to laser range finder, depth information from Kinect and similar sensors has low depth resolution and a limited distance range. To deal with such kind of noise contained in the depth image, traditional plane segmentation methods [16, 20] resort to appearance based cues from RGB image. For example, [16] infers the assignment of points

140 to planes by modeling Graph-Cuts with color and depth information, while [20] utilizes detected line segments in color image to decide about region continuity. However, we believe that integrating color information here is a double sword, since the RGB image maybe noisy. Therefore, we use only 3D point clouds for plane detection and propose a plane segmentation algorithm that is designed to
 145 work with point clouds generated by Kinect like sensors.

Plane Segmentation: We first determine the direction of gravity [10] and then rotate the point clouds to make them aligned with room coordinates. A normal vector N_p is estimated for each point p that has valid depth information, which we call a *valid* point. To initialize plane candidates, we uniformly sample
 150 triple point sets on the depth map and store them in set $T = \{(p_{i1}, p_{i2}, p_{i3}), i = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then for each $t_i \in T$ we find inliers S_i in the 3D space and a plane candidate P_i in RANSAC framework [21]. Each inlier is represented by a pixel in the depth map and a corresponding 3D valid point. See steps 1-6 in Algorithm 1. The definition of inliers follows below.

In general, a point is considered as an inlier when its distance to the plane is within certain constant range [22, 23]. However, as indicated in [24], depth resolution (i.e., minimum depth difference that can be measured by a sensor) is inversely proportional to the depth, which is defined in Eq (4), where f is focal length, b is base length of Kinect sensors, m is the parameter of a linear normalization and Z represents depth value. Therefore, we vary plane inlier distance tolerance based on depth resolution rather than heuristically choosing one constant threshold.

$$D_{tol} = (\frac{m}{fb}) * Z^2 \quad (4)$$

155 We define a point p to be an *inlier* of plane P_i if $d(p, P_i) < D_{tol}(d)$, where d is the Euclidean distance in 3D space. We then remove plane candidates which have small number of pixels and merge spatially close and nearly coplanar planes. However, many fake planes which consider points of other non-planar objects as inliers exist due to noisy surface normals and depth. To filter out
 160 fake planes (steps 10-20 of Algorithm 1), we first compute connected components

$CC_i = \{c_{i1}, \dots, c_{ij}, \dots\}$ of pixels in S_i in the depth map. Then we fit a plane $P_{c_{ij}}$ to 3D points in each connected component c_{ij} and estimate the plane parameters, including its normal $N_{P_{c_{ij}}}$. We assume that $N_{P_{c_{ij}}}$ should be at least similar to N_{P_i} . Hence, if the angle between N_{P_i} and $N_{P_{c_{ij}}}$ is large, we
165 remove the connected component c_{ij} from CC_i . We then re-estimate plane parameters of P_i based on inlier points in survived components.

For plane segmentation, which is performed on the depth map, we assign to plane P_i corresponding pixels in image plane if $d(p, P_i) < 3D_{tol}(p)$. The goal is to avoid artificial holes on plane segments on the depth map. Since
170 now preliminary plane segments are available, we further remove false positive plane segments by checking statistical features, i.e., average to-plane distance d_{avg} and average normal angle $angle_{avg}$ between the average of normals of points in S_i and plane normal N_{P_i} . More details are illustrated in Algorithm 1. To our best knowledge, we are the first to segment multiple indoor planes by
175 considering quadratic sensor noise model and relying purely on 3D point cloud. [24] only proposed the depth noise model but did not apply it to multiple plane segmentation. [16] use a linear noise model to detect planes and use color information for pixel assignment.

Plane Classification: After major planar regions are detected, we further
180 classify them into boundary and non-boundary planes, where a boundary plane is a plane with no objects behind it. Supposed that the normal vector of a plane points towards the viewer, we compute the ratio r of points on the other side of the plane to the total number of points in the room. Ideally, a planer region is a boundary plane if r is zero. We set r to 0.01 to tolerate the sensor noise.

185 2.3. Initial crude region and BBs proposals

Indoor scenes are usually composed of several predominant planar geometric structures such as ceiling, floor, wall, cabinet, etc and many small cluttered things including clothes, bottles, cups, etc. Based on this prior knowledge, we propose to generate object regions by different strategies with respect to the
190 geometric properties of image regions, rather than treating all image regions

Algorithm 1 Plane Segmentation of Indoor scenes

Input: Raw depth map and its 3d point cloud $\{p_i, i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ in room coordinate system.

Output: A series of major plane segments.

- 1: compute distance tolerance D_{tol} according to Eq. 4 and normal vector N_p for each valid point.
 - 2: uniformly sample triple point sets T on image grid.
 - 3: **for** $t \in T$ **do**
 - 4: get plane candidate P_i and its inlier set $S_i = \{p | d(p, P_i) < D_{tol}(p), \langle N_{P_i}, N_p \rangle < th_N\}$
 - 5: discard plane P_i if the inlier number in S_i is less than th_{min_pts} .
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: sort $\{P_i\}$ w.r.t # of inliers in decreasing order and remove heavily overlapping ones.
 - 8: merge spatially close and nearly parallel plane candidates.
 - 9: remove points that have multiple plane IDs from sets $\{S_i\}$.
 - 10: **for** each survived P_i **do**
 - 11: compute connected components $CC_i = \{c_{i1}, \dots, c_{ij}, \dots\}$ of S_i in the depth map.
 - 12: **for** each component c_{ij} **do**
 - 13: remove c_{ij} from S_i if its size is small. O/W, estimate plane $P_{c_{ij}}$ by RANSAC.
 - 14: **if** $\text{acos}(N_{P_i}, N_{P_{c_{ij}}}) > 10^\circ$ **then**
 - 15: add new plane $P_{c_{ij}}$ to the plane set if $\text{size}(c_{ij}) > th_{min_pts}$; remove points c_{ij} from S_i .
 - 16: **end if**
 - 17: **end for**
 - 18: discard P_i if the remaining inliers is less than th_{min_pts} .
 - 19: **end for**
 - 20: re-estimate plane parameters for P_i by RANSAC on its current inliers.
 - 21: re-sort planes w.r.t their number of inliers in decreasing order.
 - 22: assign pixels to planes one by one if $d(p, P_i) < 3 \cdot D_{tol}(p)$ and $\langle N_{P_i}, N_p \rangle < th_N$
 - 23: for each plane, remove its components where $d_{avg} > D_{tol_{avg}}$ and $angle_{avg} > th_a$
 - 24: filter out plane component whose size is less than th_{min_pts} .
-

uniformly. Since low level image segmentations often indicate cues for object candidate shapes and locations, we adopt Multi-Channel Multi-Scale (MCMS) segmentations for obtaining crude object segments. Note that segments obtained from MCMS segmentation are crude (either too coarse or too fine), and they do not represent final instance segments we are looking for. We utilize five different strategies, described below, to select crude segments for initializing object BB proposals.

For objects in Non-Planar Regions (NPRs) (e.g., cups, faucets etc.) all segments except those that have small overlapping area with NPRs are used, while for objects in Planar-Regions (PRs) (e.g., pictures, papers, etc.) only segments that are generated from RGB channel segmentation and lie in the planar areas are reserved. Segments from Detected Planes (DPs) can be used directly for objects such as ceiling, wall, floor, etc. However, sometimes big objects are inclined to be decomposed into several planar regions (e.g., bed and sofa), and then it is very likely that the proposed bounding boxes are not covering the whole object.

To address this problem, we focus our attention on non-boundary planes, which usually represent big objects like bed or other furniture. For each non-boundary planar region, we then find its border points, which are used to compute minimum distance to other non-boundary planer regions. This distance is used to merge non-boundary planar regions that are close in 3D space (within 5cm) to obtain Merged Planar Regions (MPRs). BBs are then fitted to MPRs.

In addition, we apply Hierarchical Clustering (HC) to 3D point cloud to obtain object instances that are ambiguous in the color image while separated well in 3D world.

2.3.1. Multi-Channel Multi-Scale (MCMS) image segmentations

Indoor scenes typically consists of a relatively large number of alike objects that are often cluttered and in disorder, which makes our task of finding a small set of high quality class independent object candidates non-trivial. Moreover, the contents in images are intrinsically organized in a hierarchical way. For

example, in Figure 5, the "bed" can refer only to mattress and box part or include everything on its top such as sheet and pillows. Besides, indoor scene objects are always in different sizes, colors and shapes, and presented under various light conditions. Therefore, it seems impossible to get object partitions
225 from a generic segmentation strategy that relies on a single signal. Based on these observations, we propose to initialize object locations by using low level segmentations from multiple signal channels and image scales.

In this paper, we get low level segments based on two unsupervised segmentation methods: graph based segmentation (GBS) [7] and watershed based
230 segmentation (WBS) [25] for their high computing efficiency, but other excellent generic image segmenters such as gPb-UCM [11] could also be used in our framework. For GBS, except for using color image alone, we use depth map and combined RGB-D channels for computing the edge weights of neighboring pixels at different scales respectively. To be more specific, in total we collect superpix-
235 els from 10 different layers based on GBS including 4 scales from color channel, 3 scales from depth channel and 3 scales from RGB-D fusion channels. In RGB-D fusion channels, we normalize associated 3D point coordinates extracted from raw depth into $[0, 255]$, and compute affinity weights as the maximum gradient value of RGB and depth channels. In practice, the segmentations from multi-
240 scale GBS are helpful for finding most of object locations but are inclined to ignore some salient objects that only occupy small number of pixels in images. To fixed the problem, we adopt WBS as a complementary segmentation tool, which shows more respect to salient object boundaries.

In WBS, we first smooth input maps using a 9×9 Gaussian mask and then
245 compute gradient magnitude maps. Since we care more about strong boundaries, we normalize gradient maps into $[0, 1]$ range and keep values that are above a predefined threshold (we use 0.1 in this paper). This is also useful for avoiding generating segments that are too fine. Then we apply watershed algorithm to gradient maps estimated from intensity image in CIELAB color
250 space, rawDepth map, inpainted depth map, and normals map, respectively. For each gradient map, we obtain one single layer segmentation. As is mentioned

Figure 4: An example of Euclidean clustering of 3D point cloud. (a) Color image: two adjacent blue chair instances within yellow bounding box share similar appearance. (b) The plane segmentation (refer to section 2.2). (c) 3D point clusters at 5 cm scale. (d) Proposed bounding boxes (red) based on point clusters.

in Section 2.3, using superpixels from color channel GBS only for object proposal in planar regions is an effective strategy for reducing redundant proposals obtained from other signals. But we do not apply the same strategy to WBS
 255 segmentations.

2.3.2. Euclidean clustering of point cloud

The goal of point cloud clustering is to partition 3D points into several meaningful structures. Taking advantage of 3D geometry of 3D scenes, it is able to remove ambiguities between object instances caused by similar colors
 260 or poor illuminations in indoor environments. Take the two chair instances that are within the yellow bounding box in Figure 4, for example. While it is very difficult to distinguish them based on color image alone, they are well separated in the 3D world. We adapt the Euclidean clustering algorithm in [26] for generating object candidates from 3D points.

We first remove detected predominant planes (both horizontal and vertical)
 265 from point cloud before clustering. Then we create a Kd-tree representation for the remaining 3d points. As depth data from Kinect sensor are noisy, we filter out sparsely distributed or isolated points (less than 30 cm^3) and get a point cloud P . Starting from any point $p_i \in P$ as one cluster, we search for its unlabeled neighbors that are within certain radius d_{th} and add them into the
 270 cluster. Then we keep searching neighbors for each member of current cluster until the size of cluster is stable. Clustering terminates when all points in P are

assigned a cluster label. Similar to 2D segmentation, we set multiple radii d_{th} for getting multiple scale clusters ($d_{th} \in \{2, 5, 10\}cm$). In Figure 4, we present one example of Euclidean clustering in a typical office environment, where both blue chair instances and green plant instances are well identified. Moreover, planar instances such as door and white board are also identified. We use red bounding boxes to mark identified instances.

3. Experiments

We compare our method with the state-of-the-art methods on the NYU Depth V2 dataset [16]. Since some of baselines generate their object proposals with supervised learning, for fair comparison, we follow the standard split (i.e., 795 training images / 654 test images), and report results on test set, except for plane segmentation evaluation which is measured on the whole dataset. To demonstrate, the general applicability of our approach, we also test on a large scale dataset "SUN RGBD" [17] without changing any parameters.

In our approach, we provide two sets of bounding boxes: one called BB-init, which are all bounding boxes used to initialize foreground segmentations (FG) in Section 2.1, and the other called BB-full that includes bounding boxes fitted to segments obtained by FG plus bounding boxes fitted to segments obtained by plane and watershed segmentations.

3.1. Evaluating Plane Segmentations

We compare with two state of art works [16, 20] with respect to plane segmentation on RGB-D images. For qualitative evaluation, we provide segmentation results under different indoor scenarios in Figure 5. Both [16] and [20] utilize color image with depth map for region smoothness consideration. However, they either fail to detect certain predominant planar regions or have planar regions spread across multiple object boundaries, while our method shows more respect to geometric boundaries and have most major planes detected (e.g., the window frame plane in the office). In addition, we provide quantitative evaluation in

Method	Silberman <i>et al.</i> [16]	Khan <i>et al.</i> [20]	Ours
EPC JI	34.15%	33.87%	36.72%
E+NPC JI	30.91%	32.33%	32.67%

Table 1: Performance comparison of plane segmentations on NYU Depth V2 dataset. Jaccard Index (JI) is used as metric for evaluating obtained planar segments w.r.t. both Exactly Planar Classes (EPC) and Exact and Nearly Planar Classes (E+NPC).

Table 1. Following [20], we consider both Exactly Planar Classes (EPC) (e.g., floor, ceiling, wall, cabinet etc) and Exact and Nearly Planar Classes (E+NPC) (e.g., bookshelf, books, sofa, bed etc) for evaluation. We compare the obtained planar segments with planar object instances by averaged Jaccard Index. In
305 both cases, our method outperforms the other two methods.

Failure cases analysis

In the Figure 5, we present 4 scenes that have failure detection cases. One case is false positive. For example, in the fifth row, the man’s body and part of his arm has been identified as one plane. And in the 6th row, the surface of the
310 ladder is merged with the green bag since they are co-planar in the space. The other case is missing detection. Taking the 7th row for example, a majority part of scene is lacking of depth data since infra-red light was lost under a strong sun shine. Another example is from last row where the table is transparent so that the raw depth does not reflect a real plane surface.

3.2. Evaluating Object Region Proposals

3.2.1. NYU-V2 Dataset

In this section, we compare our object proposal approach with five state-of-the-art class independent object proposal methods on NYU-V2 RGBD dataset. MCG[12], MCG3D[13], and gPb3D [10] are supervised methods, and CPMC [8],
320 CPMC3D [9] are unsupervised methods (excluding segments ranking). Following MCG [12], for object segmentation evaluation, we compute global Jaccard Index (i.e., intersection over the union of two sets) at instance level as the average best overlap for all the ground truth instances in the dataset, in order to

Figure 5: Examples of qualitative plane segmentations for RGB-D indoor scenes. The 1st column are original color images. The 2nd column presents plane segmentations by Silberman *et al.* [16]. The 3rd column shows plane segmentations by Khan *et al.* [20]. We present our segmentation results in the last column. The black pixels mark non-planar objects. The last four rows show some failure cases.

Figure 6: Quantitative evaluation of object region proposals with respect to the number of object candidates on NYU-V2 RGBD dataset. Left: recall curves on proposed bounding boxes evaluation. Right: average best Jaccard Index curves on proposed segments evaluation. Note the curves of MCG3D and CPMC3D are based on supervised ranking of segments, while the other curves including ours do not use any ranking.

avoid bias on object sizes. For object location proposals, we define bounding
 325 box proposal recall score as the ratio of positive predictions that exceed 0.5
 Jaccard score, over the number of all ground truth object instance locations.
 As is shown in Table 2 and Figure 6, our method achieves the best performance
 (91.1%) for object location proposals while our number of maximum proposals
 is only 40% of the rank-2 method MCG3D[13]. Moreover, our initial bound-
 330 ing boxes require even less proposals (21% of [13]) while the recall score only
 degrades 2% w.r.t the best performance.

For object instances proposal, our method also show very competitive per-
 formance: our score is 0.9% less than the best performance but our number of
 proposals is less than half of theirs. It is worth noting that we do not rank our
 335 bounding box proposals in our result presentation, while [13, 9] perform super-
 vised ranking. Since we already provide high quality object segmentations with
 much less number of proposals in a complete unsupervised framework, ranking
 proposals is beyond the scope of this paper.

In addition, we provide results of global Jaccard index at class level for both
 340 object location and segmentation proposals in Figure 7. We divide 894 classes
 into 40 classes following the definition of [10] including 37 specific object classes

	[10]	[8]	[9]	[12]	[13]	Ours-BB-init	Ours-BB-full
Global Best (bbox)	0.74	0.706	0.473	0.879	0.901	0.893	0.911
Global Best (seg)	0.67	0.646	0.478	0.737	0.779	-	0.77
# Proposals	1051	885	138	4202	7482	1575	3066

Table 2: Performance comparison of best global Jaccard Index at instance level for both bounding box and segment proposals on NYU-V2 RGBD dataset.

Figure 7: Classwise (40-class) performance comparisons based on the standard PASCAL metric (Jaccard Index) at object instance level for both bounding box and segment proposals on the NYU-v2 RGB-D dataset.

	no NPR	no PR	no DP	no HC	no MPR	Ours-full
Global Best (bbox)	0.666	0.813	0.889	0.897	0.901	0.911
Global Best (seg)	0.610	0.699	0.733	0.748	0.753	0.77

Table 3: Ablation study: each time we remove one of the five object proposal strategies from the full system and report how the performance degrades with respect to both bounding box and segment proposals.

and 3 abstract classes: "other struct", "other furniture" and "other props", which include 68, 82, 707 subclasses respectively. We obtaine best performance on 26 classes for object location proposals and 9 classes for segment proposals.

345 It is worth noting that our method achieves best performances on the three abstract classes for object location proposals. It indicates that our approach is general to different object types since abstract classes cover 95.8% subclasses and 32.3% instances on the test set.

Except for quantitative evaluation, we also provide qualitative evaluation for
350 proposed object regions in Figure 8. The first six scenes show objects that have been segmented successfully, and in the last two rows we list several failures cases. The grabcut segmenter is inclined to fail either when the foreground and background have similar color information, or when the foreground object is too small or has irregular shapes (e.g, plants).

355 Ablation Study

In order to understand the individual impact of the five proposal strategies on the performance of our RGB-Depth object proposal system, we evaluate our algorithm on the NYU-V2 RGB-D dataset by removing one strategy each time. The corresponding results are listed in the table 3. As can be seen
360 all the strategies contributes to the performance. The ranking of strategies in decreasing significance order is NPR, PR, DP, HC, and MPR.

3.2.2. SUN RGBD Dataset

We also test our unsupervised approach without changing any parameters on the recently released SUN RGBD dataset. SUN RGBD is a large scale indoor

Figure 8: Qualitative performance evaluation for proposed object segments on NYU-V2 RGBD dataset. Object proposals are highlighted with green color. And several failure cases are provided at the last two rows.

365 scenes dataset with a similar scale as PASCAL VOC. It contains 10,335 RGB-D images in total, which are collected from four different active sensors: Intel RealSense, Asus Xtion, Microsoft Kinect v1 and v2. While the first three sensors obtain depth map using IR structured light, the Kinect v2 (kv2) estimates the depth based on time-of-flight. With respect to raw depth data quality, kv2 can
 370 measure depth with the highest accuracy but at the same time there are a lot of small black holes in the depth map due to light absorption or reflection. The RealSense has the lowest raw depth quality.

	SUN RGB-D dataset [17]				
Sensors	Kinect v1		Kinect v2	RealSense	Xtion
Resources	B3DO [27]	NYUV2	*	*	SUN3D [28]
Global Best (bbox)	0.929	0.911	0.908	0.909	0.912
Global Best (segment)	0.742	0.77	0.746	0.745	0.752
# proposals	2972	3066	2971	4628	2969

Table 4: Performance evaluation of our method on the large scale SUN RGB-D dataset, the images of which are collected from four different RGB-D sensors. *: newly captured RGB-D images in [17].

As can be seen in Table 4, in general, our approach exhibits similar performance to the NYUV-2 dataset. We observe that while the bounding box
 375 predictions show consistent performance, the accuracy of instance proposals degrades around 2%. This reasonable degradation might be due to higher variance in sensor depth resolution. The average number of proposals is similar to the number on NYUV-2 dataset except for the tests on RealSense data, where it increases by around 50%. This is expected as the effective depth range of
 380 RealSense is very short (depth becomes very noisy or missing beyond 3.5m).

4. Conclusion

We propose an unsupervised unified framework for class independent object bounding box and segment proposals. Our method produces object regions with very comparable qualities to the state-of-the-arts while requiring much

385 less proposals, which indicates its great potential for high level tasks such as
object detection and recognition. The source code will be available on authors’
websites.

5. Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foun-
390 dation under Grant No. IIS-1302164.

References

- [1] R. G. Cinbis, J. Verbeek, C. Schmid, Segmentation driven object detection with fisher vectors, in: Computer Vision (ICCV), 2013 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 2968–2975.
- 395 [2] P. Viola, M. J. Jones, Robust real-time face detection, International journal of computer vision 57 (2) (2004) 137–154.
- [3] P. F. Felzenszwalb, R. B. Girshick, D. McAllester, D. Ramanan, Object detection with discriminatively trained part-based models, Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on 32 (9) (2010) 1627–1645.
- 400 [4] B. Hariharan, P. Arbeláez, R. Girshick, J. Malik, Simultaneous detection and segmentation, in: Computer Vision–ECCV 2014, Springer, 2014, pp. 297–312.
- [5] J. Dong, Q. Chen, S. Yan, A. Yuille, Towards unified object detection and semantic segmentation, in: Computer Vision–ECCV 2014, Springer, 2014,
405 pp. 299–314.
- [6] J. R. Uijlings, K. E. van de Sande, T. Gevers, A. W. Smeulders, Selective search for object recognition, International journal of computer vision 104 (2) (2013) 154–171.

- [7] P. F. Felzenszwalb, D. P. Huttenlocher, Efficient graph-based image segmentation, *International Journal of Computer Vision* 59 (2) (2004) 167–181.
- [8] J. Carreira, C. Sminchisescu, Cpmc: Automatic object segmentation using constrained parametric min-cuts, *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* 34 (7) (2012) 1312–1328.
- [9] D. Lin, S. Fidler, R. Urtasun, Holistic scene understanding for 3d object detection with rgb-d cameras, in: *Computer Vision (ICCV), 2013 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2013*, pp. 1417–1424.
- [10] S. Gupta, P. Arbelaez, J. Malik, Perceptual organization and recognition of indoor scenes from rgb-d images, in: *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2013 IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2013*, pp. 564–571.
- [11] P. Arbelaez, M. Maire, C. Fowlkes, J. Malik, Contour detection and hierarchical image segmentation, *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* 33 (5) (2011) 898–916.
- [12] P. Arbelaez, J. Pont-Tuset, J. Barron, F. Marques, J. Malik, Multiscale combinatorial grouping, in: *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2014 IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2014*, pp. 328–335.
- [13] S. Gupta, R. Girshick, P. Arbeláez, J. Malik, Learning rich features from rgb-d images for object detection and segmentation, in: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014, Springer, 2014*, pp. 345–360.
- [14] V. Hedau, D. Hoiem, D. Forsyth, Recovering the spatial layout of cluttered rooms, in: *Computer vision, 2009 IEEE 12th international conference on, IEEE, 2009*, pp. 1849–1856.
- [15] C. Rother, V. Kolmogorov, A. Blake, Grabcut: Interactive foreground extraction using iterated graph cuts, *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* 23 (3) (2004) 309–314.

- [16] N. Silberman, D. Hoiem, P. Kohli, R. Fergus, Indoor segmentation and support inference from rgb-d images, in: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2012*, Springer, 2012, pp. 746–760.
- [17] S. Song, S. P. Lichtenberg, J. Xiao, Sun rgb-d: A rgb-d scene understanding
440 benchmark suite, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015, pp. 567–576.
- [18] Y. Boykov, G. Funka-Lea, Graph cuts and efficient nd image segmentation, *International journal of computer vision* 70 (2) (2006) 109–131.
- [19] A. Levin, D. Lischinski, Y. Weiss, Colorization using optimization, in:
445 *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, Vol. 23, ACM, 2004, pp. 689–694.
- [20] S. H. Khan, M. Bennamoun, F. Sohel, R. Togneri, Geometry driven semantic labeling of indoor scenes, in: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014*, Springer, 2014, pp. 679–694.
- [21] M. A. Fischler, R. C. Bolles, Random sample consensus: a paradigm for
450 model fitting with applications to image analysis and automated cartography, *Communications of the ACM* 24 (6) (1981) 381–395.
- [22] D. Hähnel, W. Burgard, S. Thrun, Learning compact 3d models of indoor and outdoor environments with a mobile robot, *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 44 (1) (2003) 15–27.
- [23] J. Poppinga, N. Vaskevicius, A. Birk, K. Pathak, Fast plane detection
455 and polygonalization in noisy 3d range images, in: *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2008. IROS 2008. IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, IEEE, 2008, pp. 3378–3383.
- [24] K. Khoshelham, S. O. Elberink, Accuracy and resolution of kinect depth
460 data for indoor mapping applications, *Sensors* 12 (2) (2012) 1437–1454.
- [25] F. Meyer, Color image segmentation, in: *Image Processing and its Applications, 1992.*, International Conference on, IET, 1992, pp. 303–306.

- [26] R. B. Rusu, Semantic 3d object maps for everyday manipulation in human living environments, *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz* 24 (4) (2010) 345–348.
- 465 [27] A. Janoch, S. Karayev, Y. Jia, J. T. Barron, M. Fritz, K. Saenko, T. Darrell, A category-level 3d object dataset: Putting the kinect to work, in: *Consumer Depth Cameras for Computer Vision*, Springer, 2013, pp. 141–165.
- 470 [28] J. Xiao, A. Owens, A. Torralba, Sun3d: A database of big spaces reconstructed using sfm and object labels, in: *Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2013 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 1625–1632.